THEOLOGY

VOL. XLV SEPTEMBER, 1942 No. 267

NOTICE

To comply with the regulations of the Paper Control it has become necessary to reduce the number of pages drastically, from 64 to 24, beginning with the October number. Smaller size of print will be used throughout and each number will contain at least 12,000 words.

Further, the circulation must be cut down by printing fewer copies. No copies will be available for casual purchasers. It is hoped that all regular subscribers will receive copies, but if some should be left out we trust they will make arrangements to share with friends.

The price, which was raised to 1s. 6d. in January last, will revert to 1s., 12s. a year post free prepaid. Those who have paid in advance will be given credit for the unexpired portion of their extra subscription. Thus if 15s. was paid in January, to cover the calendar year, the subscriber will receive one extra number, and so in proportion, the subscriber being given the benefit of any doubt.

The Liturgy and the Gospel

AN awakening interest in the principles and practice of Common Prayer is not the monopoly of a single Christian communion. On the contrary, it derives a stimulus, even if it cannot be said to take its origin, from the growing readiness of Christians of different confessions to learn from one another and to enter more fully into the common heritage of Christian experience. Where liturgical worship is already known and valued, we find a desire to understand it better and to bring its meaning home to the ordinary worshipper. Where, in the past, it has not been greatly appreciated or understood, there is undoubtedly a feeling after liturgical form. The word liturgy in itself is no longer a cause of mutual suspicion and misunderstanding.

This alone would be cause for encouragement, but fortunately there is more to be said. We cannot explain the liturgical revival as a by-product of an interest in reunion. There are other revivals with which it is not unconnected. We cannot, for instance, ignore the tendency in the leading thinkers of most denominations to treat the historic documents of their own confessions (as well as the classic formulations of primitive doctrine) with the theological seriousness which they deserve. It is this above all that gives ground for the hope that theology rather than expediency or sentiment will increasingly direct the future course of the liturgical movement.

It is open, of course, to the cynical to suggest that the real significance of this growing interest in the forms of worship is to be found in a general and lamentable decline in church attendance. Addison's familiar description of a Country Sunday " when the whole Village meet together with their best Faces, and in their cleanliest Habits, to converse with one another upon indifferent Subjects, hear their Duties explained to them, and join together in Adoration of the Supreme Being " (*Spectator*, 112) is sufficiently remote from our common experience to lead us to question the *Spectator's* right to a professed satisfaction with his own. We hide our disappointment with things as they are under the cover of a fastidious criticism of things as they were. We persuade ourselves that the simple, homely language of the eighteenth century is an outrage on our sense of liturgical decency ! We cannot dismiss this taunt out of hand as a cynical caricature; even a caricature has its salutary warning. An " interest " in the liturgy can be a dangerous thing. The study of the primitive forms of worship can be as absorbing —and as unrelated to the living experience of the Church— as the study of fossils or of ancient coins. The zeal of the antiquary is no substitute for the reverence of the worshipper. We may lose the significance of the Church's rites in a preoccupation with their ceremonial accompaniments. Liturgical worship is neither a gymnastic exercise nor an æsthetic experience. On the other hand, there are those who are so afraid of an academic or frivolous interest in the liturgy, out of touch with the needs of the masses without, and even of the worshippers within, the Church, that they find themselves driven, as they suppose, to talk of the psychology of worship, and to busy themselves with an analysis of their own reactions to the variety of liturgical

forms. It is easy enough (as Brunner once said to me about ascetic theology) to fix our attention on our own finger instead of looking beyond it to the place to which it is pointing. Introspection is the death of the liturgy. The final criterion of the forms of Common Prayer is not their "relevance" to the supposed requirements of the public mind and temper, but their faithfulness in pointing to the Gospel.

The root of our danger, here as in other things, is the tendency to put asunder the things that God has joined. Christian history, Christian doctrine, Christian worship and the Christian life are not four isolated and independent objects of study. Any approach to the understanding of one of them must involve a true appreciation of all. The history of Christian worship is nothing less than the story of the living, thinking, worshipping Church of God. The liturgy enshrines the truth of revelation—it is dogmatic; it links us to the Church of all ages—it is historical; it speaks to the life of each generation—it is profoundly ethical. The dry bones of history, doctrine, and precept come to life in the living experience of a praying community of believers.

But we must underline the word "believers." What we believe in is the Gospel; or rather we believe in Him to whom the Gospel bears witness. That is to say, the liturgy is only dogmatic, historical, and ethical in a Christian sense, when we recognize that the proper adjective to apply to it is "evangelical." History, doctrine, worship and the Christian life, derive their meaning—and their unity—from the Gospel. When we insist on driving wedges between them, we are mutilating the Gospel which gives them meaning. When we act or speak as though they could be separated, we are rending the seamless robe. We are often guilty of the same schismatic spirit in our attitude to worship itself. A wedge was driven long ago between sermon and service. Hooker found it necessary to uphold the liturgy as "a duty entire in itself, a duty requisite to be performed much oftener than sermons can possibly be made" (*Eccl. Pol.* 5. 28. 3) against those who exalted the preaching of the Word alone. Dr Johnson was punctilious in his attendance at church, especially when there was no sermon, in deliberate opposition to the tendency of his age. We have heard, on the other hand, of the newspaper reporter who wrote that "Mr So-and-so, after the usual preliminaries,

preached the sermon." We can believe the story or not; no one can deny that it has point. But is not the point precisely this, that the man who could describe the liturgy as " the usual preliminaries " to the preaching not only failed to understand the service but, more likely than not, failed equally to understand the sermon, regarding it as an expression of the preacher's views on life and letters? Both Hooker and Johnson were too judicious to belittle the sermon in their attempt to do honour to the service. The newspaper man was unconsciously belittling both. Sermon and service alike derive their meaning from the Word which, each in its own way, they proclaim. We may say, if we will, that the sermon is directed to men for their edification, and that the liturgy is directed to God for His glory. But the words of the preacher are the vehicle of the Word of God, and this Word does not return to Him void; it returns to Him for His glory in the faith and obedience of the hearers. And the liturgy, which is an act of worship *ad Dei majorem gloriam*, returns again to the worshippers who offer it, as a living proclamation of the Word of God which enables them to worship Him better. Thus the spoken word is the medium of the act of God, and the act of worship is an expression of God's Word. To drive a wedge between sermon and service (or for that matter between mattins and eucharist or between any other acts of worship) is to weaken the witness, and so to impair the significance, of both alike.

The significance of the liturgy is the peculiar witness that it bears to the Gospel of God. The witness is fourfold—in words, in form, in its principles, and in its requirements.

(1) The words of the liturgy are predominantly the words of Scripture. Scripture readings from the time of Justin Martyr (" the writings of the prophets and the memoirs of the apostles ") have formed an integral part of the Order of Holy Communion. In the Book of Common Prayer, the first and second lessons stand as the twin pillars of the daily services of Morning and Evening Prayer. The psalter itself is, and has always been, the Church's hymn book. Most of the canticles are the evangelical hymns of the New Testament psalmist. The Lord's Prayer is used as the pattern of, and therefore as the introduction to, every corporate act of prayer and praise. The versicles and responses, again, are echoes of the prayers in the psalter. The ancient collects reflect the language of Scripture even more strikingly

by indirect suggestion than some of the later collects do by direct quotation.

(2) This wealth of scriptural material has not been thrown together haphazard. There is a pattern and a meaning in the whole. The very order of the prayers and praises bears witness to the intention of its framers, which was to set forth the truth of the Gospel in dramatic form. The liturgy is fundamentally evangelical. St Paul himself described the act of eating and drinking at the Supper as a showing forth of the Lord's death till He come (1 Cor. xi, 26). The eucharist is the supreme example of the liturgical drama, but it is not the only one. We can find another in the daily Order for Morning and Evening Prayer. It was the view of Charles Simeon (whom Canon Smyth has recently set before us as the evangelical champion of church order) that "the finest sight short of heaven would be a whole congregation using the prayers of the Liturgy in the true spirit of them" (*Simeon and Church Order*, p. 291). The true spirit of the liturgy, as Simeon well knew, is the spirit of the Gospel itself. Consider the Order for Evening Prayer. We move through the acts of an unfolding drama. In the psalms and the first lesson we see the preparation for the fulness of the times, the choice of a single race to be the instrument of God's good purpose. In the *Magnificat* we see God's choice of a single person within that race. The Song of Mary is the fitting link between the Old Testament and the New, celebrating God's use of the humble and obedient. The Song of Simeon is the song of the universal Church, of all who have seen God's salvation in Jesus, the light of the Gentiles and the glory of Israel. The Creed is the response of the believing Church of all ages to the Word of God. It ends with words which point beyond the things of time and speak of the final victory of the Christian through Christ. In the prayers that follow, the truth of the past is declared to be the abiding truth by which the faithful live; the God of our fathers, of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is the living God. There are yet unwritten chapters in the story of the acts of the Holy Spirit. If anything is lacking in this presentation before God and man of the living Gospel, it is, as a foreigner who had frequently shared in it acutely observed, an explicit reference to the eschatology which is enshrined, at the heart of the eucharist, in the words "till He come." But even this lack is largely supplied in the closing words of the Creed,

in the lessons of Scripture, and in the witness of the Church's Year. Eschatology is the Biblical perspective, and it is at least implied in every use of the language of Scripture for prayer or praise.

We have grown shy—or contemptuous—of the phrase " our incomparable liturgy," but there is still something to be learnt from those who used it. *The Beauty of Holiness in the Common Prayer* is the title of a little book by Thomas Bisse, D.D., written in the early years of the eighteenth century. There is something more in the Doctor's encomium than an appreciation of literary charm. He refers to " that admirable order and chain whereby the several parts and offices of the common prayer are held together." " Now the rehearsal of the Creed is placed between the duties of hearing and of prayer; it comes after the reading of God's most holy word, and goes before the asking of those things that are necessary as well for the body as the soul." " As at the first when the Angel had publish'd the glad tidings of Salvation, he was joined by a multitude of the heavenly Host; so now when the same glad tidings revealed in the New Testament are rehearsed by the Minister, he is likewise joined by the whole multitude of the Congregation, praising God and saying, Blessed be the Lord God of Israel." These references to the Creed and the *Benedictus* are enough to reveal the writer's sense that the order of the Common Prayer is itself a witness to the Gospel of our salvation. The liturgical service is nothing less than the Creed in song. If the fact were more generally appreciated, we should be spared even the occasional shock of " a shortened evensong," in which the Old Testament lesson is usually the first to suffer. To mutilate a drama is bad enough; when that drama is the presentation of acts of God in history, it is inexcusable.

The liturgy, then, is a proclamation of the Christian Creed. But what, after all, is the Creed ? Dr Whale has lately called attention—significantly in a course of lectures on Christian Doctrine—to Calvin's opinion that the Nicene Creed is more suitably sung, as a song of praise, than used as a bare statement of belief (*Christian Doctrine*, p. 106). Bishop Ken, in *The Practice of Divine Love*, which is a short exposition of the Church Catechism, makes a similar statement about the Apostles' Creed. " Every article includes a blessing as well as a mystery, and is as proper to excite our love as to engage our faith." The Creed is a warm and

living act of trust in the Personal God; the liturgy which both includes and illustrates it can be no less. When the Bible speaks of an open confession or declaration (*exomologeisthai*) we are never far from the secondary meaning of the word, " to offer praise," and sometimes this meaning is predominant (*cf.* Isa. xlv, 23, Phil. ii, 11). Every liturgical service is, in the widest sense of the word, eucharistic. It is only when we understand what the Creed is that we can see why the greatest acts of praise, like the *Te Deum* and the *Gloria in Excelsis*, have been cast, inevitably, in a credal form. The " liturgical fragments " of the New Testament are already pointing in the same direction. " Great is the mystery of godliness; He who was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached among the nations, believed on in the world, received up in glory " (1 Tim. iii, 16). It is this foundation of the liturgy in the Gospel, and this truth that the Creed is itself an act of praise, that guard the Church which possesses an historic liturgy from the ever-present danger of equating orthodoxy with right opinion and of losing the Word of God in human systems.

(3) There are certain fundamental principles in liturgical worship. These principles are founded in the Gospel. It is enough to mention three of them. The liturgy is designed as a corporate act; it is concerned with the great abiding truths of creation and redemption; it bears upon all the manifold experiences of human life. The liturgy is, first, the act of the worshipping Body. The noteworthy feature of the liturgical revival in the Roman Catholic Church is the deliberate attempt to restore to the congregation its full share in the Church's worship. When the Church of England insists that the language of Common Prayer shall be " understanded of the people " it is appealing to the same sound principle. It is offering a privilege and setting forth a responsibility to the laity. The liturgy is not mumbo-jumbo. We do not enhance its dignity with mysteries of our own devising. It is worth recalling Sir Roger de Coverley's comment to his companion at the end of the third act of what he had been assured was " a good Church of England comedy." " But pray, says he, you that are a Critick, is the Play according to your Dramatick Rules, as you call them? Should your People in Tragedy always talk to be understood? Why, there is not a single Sentence in this Play that I do not know the meaning of." The

phraseology and form of the drama which we call the liturgy is not likely to be immediately intelligible to the casual observer. The liturgy would be a poor thing if they were. It takes a worshipper to understand it, and even the constant worshipper has to grow into it. But the " mystery " of the liturgy is none other than the mystery of the Gospel itself—the open secret of God's redemptive activity in Jesus Christ. And this is known to that mystical body which is the blessed company of all faithful people. It is a Scriptural principle that the Common Prayer should be truly corporate worship. To talk of Mr X or Canon Y " taking the service " is really an unhappy expression of sacerdotalism. But it is clear that for an intelligent participation in the Church's worship, the congregation needs not only to understand the words of the service, but to enter into the meaning of its form and principles—and to see both in their relation to the Gospel.

The second principle of liturgical worship we may call its objectivity. It represents the " givenness " of the Christian revelation. The gospel is not something abstracted from our inner consciousness. We do not probe our own souls to discover the truth. The truth we celebrate is a Truth which is set before our eyes (1 John i, 1). It exists in its own right, and it is given. We do not create it, nor does it exist for our convenience.

The understanding of the liturgy is a sovereign remedy for the disease of theological pragmatism. For the prayers of the liturgy are not topical; they are not devised to meet the particular problems of the individuals gathered together at any given moment, or even of the age or society in which they live. They are concerned with the particular acts of God in history, and with the universal needs of mankind which God's acts both reveal and supply. The liturgy, like the Gospel, demands the reversal of our common notions about religion. We are afraid of " particularity " in revelation, and at the same time we insist on the satisfaction of our particular, individual, requirements. The liturgy, on the other hand, like the Gospel, calls us to see that our true needs are the needs of everyman, and that God has acted " once for all " in history for their satisfaction.

It is in this way that the liturgy is related to life, and to the life of each succeeding generation. It bears upon the problems of the day precisely because it is not built upon them. It does not turn us away from the particularity of

the present; it shows us how to face it. The sermons of F. D. Maurice on the Prayer Book, given nearly a hundred years ago in the Chapel of Lincoln's Inn, are a sufficient illustration of this truth and of what it means. When we pray for all sorts and conditions of men, for the Church militant here in earth, for the powers that be (" O Lord, save the king "), and for the gift of God's peace to our time (*cf.* the Gregorian Collect for Epiphany 2: *tuam pacem nostris concede temporibus*), we cannot claim with any truth that the liturgy encourages us in an otherworldly pietism. Here again the liturgy illustrates the Gospel, for the Gospel speaks to man as he is.

(4) The requirements of Common Prayer, the dispositions necessary for a true share in it, are the necessary consequence of the principles already considered. They are equally rooted in the Gospel. They can be summed up in the one word " subordination." We place ourselves under the Word of God. We allow Him to speak before we pray. We seek not our own satisfaction but His glory, believing that all other things will be added unto us. We " follow the great wheel of the Church," not desiring to be a law unto ourselves. To demand the liturgy of our personal choice, however venerable and attractive it may be, before that which is given by the authority under which we live, is to destroy the very meaning of the liturgy and to be left with none. " Some persons have the bishop's name on their lips, but in everything act apart from him." The words of Ignatius of Antioch (Magnesians 4) have not lost their sting. We may use them as they stand or substitute the word " liturgy " for " bishop," for both bishop and liturgy represent the " givenness " of the Gospel and the Christian duty of submission one to another for the Lord's sake.

Finally, in the Common Prayer we place ourselves side by side with our neighbour—and under him, not looking each to his own things, but each also to the things of others (Phil. ii, 1 *ff.*). The language of the liturgy is not " I " but " we "; Our Father. If the Common Prayer is to be indeed a common act, there must be in every worshipper a putting aside of self, a refusal to cling to his independent self-hood. We cannot demand the immediate satisfaction of our passing moods. The liturgy is " emotion under control " (Guardini), and the restraint of its language, which is necessary if all are to use it at all times, imposes a

spiritual discipline, which only those who know the meaning of Charity (*Agape*) will undergo gladly and freely. But *Agape* takes us to the heart of the Gospel and to the height of its ethical demands. It is not, then, without significance that the hymn of St Paul to *Agape* follows immediately on his appeal for mutual subordination in worship.

The requirements of the liturgy, no less than its principles, its words and its form, bear witness to the truth of the Gospel and its meaning for life. We need no other grounds, nor would any others by themselves suffice, for commending and justifying its use in the Church of God.

W. S. T. Wright.

The True Israelite: A Study of the Man of Providence[1]

Divine Providence in observable history is not discussed directly in this paper because, urgent and fascinating as the Jewish-Christian interpretation of history may be, it cannot even be expressed truthfully until the agent of its manifestation, the Man of Providence, is studied and the character of the world he presupposes elucidated. Israel, who strove with God and with men (Gen. xxxii, 28), obtaining a blessing, typifies the activity of the Israelite indeed; in the supreme cases of Jeremiah and Jesus, man's full nature and environment are brought into play. Such are Men of Providence because they co-operate with God's activity and dispense His providence towards mankind. There is the place of understanding, not only of the justice of God, but also of the world wherein men find themselves; it is the fount of true history and also the place where man's nature and environment are fully expressed in their true perspective. For the most part, and for most of our conscious life, we are "behind-hand" in our relation to God; it existed before we were first dimly aware of it, and even after that we follow after the event (in our consciousness), recognizing later His activity, which we may or may not deem providential. "What I do now ye do not understand, but ye will hereafter." But always, with the Israelite, there is an attempt to close up the gap, to catch up with God, even if it be only

[1] See Matthews, *God in Christian Thought and Experience*, pp. 272 *f.*

for a moment. To "see the Father working even until now, and work also"—that is the work of the Israelite, rather than the fulfilment of general ethical truths. To be a Man of Providence is to catch a glimpse of God's glory, of *His* history and activity, and respond when He says "Whom shall we send?"

The grandeur and sublimity of the theme needs no attestation. Faith in Divine Providence, it has been said,[1] is the essence of religion. This is valid if by it is meant that intuition of providence and election which is found in personal relations with God; it is of course invalid if providence is understood in its narrower philosophic sense. The present purpose is to examine the significance of certain intuitions documented in the Bible, which is taken as a convenient normative expression of the Jewish-Christian tradition. Providence, here, is equated with the Kingly Rule of God, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel, of Jeremiah and of Jesus the Christ; a God who knows men *by name*, to whom all men live. Moreover, as they find Him and live indeed, awaken to the activity which has brought them into being, they are freed from the thraldom of false gods and enter the Kingly Rule of God. It is the articulation of the Rule of God with the souls of men, seen most clearly in the men of Providence, which is examined here. Just as that phrase "Kingly Rule" stresses the King and his personal relation with the subject, rather than the "kingdom" in its results, so the present discussion is focused on the character of the articulation between God's activity and man's striving with Him, rather than on the concrete historical organizations and interpretations of God's nature which arise through the work of the Man of Providence. In the nature of that articulation may be found a clue to the character which the biblical religions have in common, that by which they are Israelites indeed.

The name "Israel," by its traditional meaning, strikes the note which is re-echoed, developed and enriched in the great religious leaders of Israel: "He strove with God and with men." Jeremiah and Jesus, the two greatest examples, manifest the travail of soul of the Man of God. We are told that ideas of holiness, of truth, of righteousness and mercy, developed in the experience of ancient Israel. This

[1] Häring, *The Christian Faith* (E.T.), vol. ii, p. 514. Quoted and discussed by Farmer, *The World and God*, p. 92.

indeed was so, but its root lay not in any organic process of evolution, but in the striving of Israel which centres in agony like Jeremiah's. This striving grows by its own travail, profiting from the richer acquaintance it has obtained of the ways of God. There can be no satiety: although Jeremiah says in one place:

> Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy words were unto me a joy and the rejoicing of mine heart: for I am called by thy name, O Lord God of Hosts.

Yet he continues:

> . . . I sat alone because of thy hand; for thou hast filled me with indignation.
> Why is my pain perpetual, and my wound incurable, which refuseth to be healed? wilt thou indeed be unto me as a deceitful brook, as waters that fail?
>
> (Jer. xv, 16-18. *Cf.* the famous passage xx, 7*ff.*)

First there is apprehension of God's command; then reflection upon its significance and consequence: " And if I say, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, then there is in mine heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with forbearing, and I cannot contain." The contradictions of life and the dilemmas which unaided reason finds therein are resolved in further acquaintance with God. The terrible " Thou knowest: that which came out of my lips was before thy face. Be not a terror unto me: thou art my refuge in the day of evil " (Jer. xvii, 16) foreshadows the agony of Jesus in Gethsemane and prepares the way for the serene faith of Paul that God has set forth the apostles as a spectacle for the world, for angels, and for men (1 Cor. iv, 9).

The divine dissatisfaction which arises from awareness of God's prevenient activity in men's lives is the hall-mark of religion. At a low level it may go little further than a recognition of the fact that only at forty do men know how to live at twenty; but Pascal can go further, saying, " Thou wouldest not seek Me, if thou hadst not found Me." And Augustine: " Too late have I come to love Thee." And again: " Let us delight to find Thee by failing to find Thee, rather than by finding Thee to fail to find Thee." This last quotation, in its Neo-Platonic fashion, suggests again that pulsation between apprehension and reflection noticed in Jeremiah, together with the conviction that the soul

cannot rest in reflection. Of the two, Augustine and Jeremiah, there can be little doubt as to which is nearer reality in his dealing with the matter.

It is suggested that these two intuitions, our " behind-hand " relation to God's activity and the primary importance of personal acquaintance (or apprehension) in the pulsation between it and the reflective ordering of experience, write large something which is true of all levels of human life. The life with which we are born grows with our attempts to grasp it; under duress from God's creative work it eludes us and dances ahead like a will-o'-the-wisp, drawing us on. For a time there may be an illusion that we have caught it; but something happens, sooner or later, to awaken us from our day-dream. Stumblings come, as they needs must, and break the shell of our little world. The activity into which, and by which, we are born, to which we awaken fitfully and partially, returns interest on our poor strivings (Mark iv, 24); we receive back more than our measure, else there were no growth, no healing, no forgiveness, no redemption. As men begin to lose themselves for God, so finding their true selves, they strive to *meet* the action of God, rather than merely to recognize it after the event (the usual context of " providential " action). Even for the Man of Providence there is no resting on the oars; on the contrary, " From him to whom much is given, more is expected." For most " Israelites," Jewish, Catholic or Protestant, getting abreast of God's action is something which may happen but once, or not at all. Yet it remains the end of all their striving.

The matter does not end there. It is the abiding conviction of the Jewish-Christian tradition that God is discovered, not reached by speculation.[1] We must begin with apprehension, consolidate it by the reflective, rational ordering of experience, then return, with greater measure, to fresh apprehension. Then the cycle begins afresh. For example, the various doctrines of Predestination and Election are products of reflective activity; whatever absurdities such attempts may lead to, the intuition from which they start remains--*i.e.*, of one who has prepared a place for us in the past, and is now doing so, who was doing it before we knew, or could know, anything about it. A common error is to make a fetish of the earlier glimmerings of this

[1] See Przywara, *Polarity* (E. T.), p. 42 and note especially pp. 52 *ff.*

truth, neglecting the need for effort to co-operate with divine activity. In this respect Calvin is less culpable than Luther. Co-operation with God's providence necessitates a striving to enter the narrow door; the cogency of the equation of " Kingly Rule of God " with " Divine Providence " is now apparent. Entering the Kingdom of God is a supreme discipline which increases in tension as men grow in obedience. The perfect obedience which is man's proper condition holds within itself the realm of disciplined thought, of rationally ordered experience. In this sense it is valid to affirm that " das Denken ist auch Gottesdienst." (*Cf.* 1 Cor. xiii, 12; 2 Cor. iii, 18.)

It has been remarked that just because we are in the midst of life we cannot know the meaning behind it. The small element of truth in such a theory is expressed in our need to stop to think; but the view put forward here insists that this be followed by richer apprehension; there can be no resting in the state of *theoria*. On the contrary, it is possible to get abreast of things, to have something of the meaning of life within oneself; in the end, there can be no meaning in the phrase " behind life." The meaning of life lies within it and through it. Reflective ordering of that which is apprehended must issue in further apprehension, or it becomes sterile and its view lop-sided. Here we are surely justified in finding one of the special characteristics of the biblical tradition, marking it off sharply from ancient and modern intellectualism.[1] As soon as this is said, we must underline the importance of submitting our apprehension of realities to the sober discipline of science, in its proper and wider sense. Our experience must be purified, whether by torah, tradition or science; for apprehension and reflection depend on each other, are inseparable in their growth. Apprehension without reason becomes an abomination—as Nazi theorists have manifested; likewise, reason, without living apprehension, becomes cold, lifeless and incapable of implementing its own findings. The meaning of life can never be adequately expressed in reflective reasoning—and yet we must ever strive to do that impossible thing. The Kingly Rule of God can never be expressed fully in terms of human history—yet that is the necessary aim of every Christian. Again, Christian dogma, interpreting the significance of the Man of Providence, must be

[1] But probably not from Aquinas: see Rousselot, *The Intellectualism of St Thomas*, Introduction.

brought to life by apprehension of Him (*cf.* Phil. iii, 7 *ff.*). It is not without significance that the nearest thing to a "system" Jesus gave His disciples was a prayer.

We have examined two of the marks of our existence which the Man of Providence makes plain: that this is a world where it takes a lot of running to get abreast of God's activity; that there is a pulsation between apprehension of realities and the reflective interpretation of them. There remains to be studied the peculiar articulation of the life so revealed with the conventional life of men; together with this goes the question of the *direction* in which the Providence dispensed by God's Man points. Is it parallel to chronological history, and therefore realizable in it, or has it no relation to the destiny of empires and peoples? The answers to these questions help to determine the nature of the Christian philosophy of history; the clues to them must naturally be sought in the Man of Providence and his travail, for there is the place of understanding, where the rhythms and currents of God's purposes for men are revealed most fully and, what is equally important, in their proper perspective. Our interpretation of observed history and of the "tempi" proper to different aspects of man's being depends upon the evidence provided by the true Israelite. The birth, death and resurrection of Christ trace out the personal rhythm of birth-death over against the impersonal generalization (in terms of generations) of ordinary history. So the Providence of God is primarily personal; as such it cannot be fulfilled within observed history, *yet history is the stuff out of which it is made.* Personal life—and the deepest current of God's Providence—is in *tension* with the history of the race: therefore it cannot be unrelated to it. The situation is analogous to that between apprehension and reflection. The tradition of the race, its civilization and culture, are the products of reflection. Science and Torah may be handed on from generation to generation. But apprehension is essentially incommunicable and has to begin afresh with every individual soul. Indeed, it constitutes that soul; the latter may profit by discipline and schooling and must utilize reflective reason, but it will remain in itself incommunicable. I am I, and Thou art Thou—and can never be less than this. Briefly, then, the direction, or "nisus," of personal human history lies parallel to apprehension, whilst that of reflection has more affinity to the history of the race. Thus, the Providence of

God for the human race—*i.e.*, in " history "—is organically connected with His deeper Providence for man as personal —and these two come together in the travail of soul of the Man of Providence.

It is the Kingly Rule of God which creates this tension, as it obtains a hold in the lives of men. The history of the world is under the Providence of God, as subject to, and mediated by, the Man of Providence. God's policy is framed on those lines; for this reason it is not surprising that His rule appears impracticable in the eyes of men who pursue a " dollar " policy. Yet it is in striving to enter the Narrow Door, not in hugging to oneself the life one thinks oneself to possess, that valid persistence consists. For—

> Whether we live, we live unto the Lord;
> And whether we die, we die unto the Lord.
> Whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.
> For to this end Christ both died and rose again,
> That He might be Lord both of the dead and of the living.

Life may be transmitted from generation to generation, as may culture and science; but the children have to digest these things, apprehend them and clothe themselves with them. The system of culture, whatever its type, cannot guarantee this of itself. The centre of gravity of God's Providence for men does not lie along the line of tradition, from generation to generation, but along the line of the *name*, of the person. It cuts across what is usually called history, and the latter is really a cross-section of the heavenly history which is beating upon our lives always, whether we co-operate with it or not. Occasionally this heavenly history is more fully revealed, is captured, in the lives of the men of Providence; then, we can discern its existence, arrange our interpretation of life in accordance with the evidence it affords.[1] This is precisely what is attempted in this paper.

[1] *Cf.* and contrast E. Lampert, THEOLOGY, April, 1942, p. 193: " . . . in reality the general course of history is deeply connected with man's personal destiny, although this link remains invisible and impenetrable." The whole point of the present argument is that the " link " *does* become " visible " and penetrable to a considerable degree in the supreme Act of God's Providence which underlies the New Testament, and whose storm-centre is Jesus. This is properly a Creative Act, by which God's providence enters *human* relations; it sets up the true " society " (Phil. iii, 20-1) *pari passu* with the true personality and its concomitant " tempo." This " new creation " is the crown of nature; it fulfils, and enables us to

Nowadays we have relinquished the old idea of gravitation as a force "working at a distance." We might profitably dispense with the similar view held of the action of God. Gravitation appears to be something in the very nature of each event in the physical world; so, as in a parable, may be described the activity of God. It has its proper expression at each level of complexity in creation—physical, chemical, biological, racial and personal. But it is in the last that the purpose of the whole, relative to man, becomes apparent. It is, therefore, clear that the freedom of the Man of God is not the freedom from the world the Buddhist seeks, but a freedom which overcomes the world. There is a tension between the world and the true man which issues in definite acts and attitudes which can be traced and studied. These are the points of tension between the full, perfect man and the merely economic man, to choose the commonest of the lop-sided aberrations men are subject to.

---

see that it fulfils, the intimations of God's Providence within the individual organism and its relation to Nature in general. We might use Mr Lampert's term *æviternitas* to describe the "tempo" of life as lived by the Paul of the later Corinthian correspondence. The language of flesh and blood is "broken," like the language of Lear and Macbeth, by the Burden it has to bear. In the case we are considering, the broken form is the true, *provided* form. This enables us to make a far more truthful analysis of the measure of reality provided for man. In a figure, it is as though men fear to launch out into the Stream of Life, to the Current of God's Providence for us. We cling to the shore, or move into back-waters—but the stream takes us away in the end—*nos habebit humus*! The "general course of history" is the story of these half-hearted excursions, and Marx was able to draw his conclusions. We rupture the structure God intends to grow and function as eternal life, here and now, by hankering after something we were never made for—escape from the world into Nibbana, or (more usually) compromise with clock-time in the assurance of a "competence." The Man of Providence, and the "new human society" He creates, seeks the current, and *He traces it out*—almost incidentally. There is sufficient of it on our side of the horizon to convey its significance. Moreover, Jesus sets up such a tidal wave that henceforth there is a strong under-current—it took up Paul of Tarsus. Actually, leaving the figure, this is mediated through personal relations in that turmoil of souls known as the Church of God. Dimly, therein, we apprehend the true "orientation" of life here which is even now "making" the "general course of history," and will eventually take it up into itself. The work of Jesus is primarily Creation; Catholicism must look to Him, not to any imagined "primordial" day of Creation or to individualism, if it is to fulfil its Biblical genius. Our notions of Creation and Providence must be brought into *subjection* to Christ crucified. (*Cf.* Toynbee's celebrated passage, *Study of History*, i, 271 *ff.*, for a similar view.)

Thus the Israelite, in being freed from the inertia of the world, is all the more responsible for the world. None are so important to history as Abraham, Moses, Jeremiah and Jesus—these *make* history in a sense beyond the reach of Alexander, Augustus, Napoleon, and even of Plato, Bacon, Newton or Shakespeare. The tension they create is observable at those points where the men of Providence are manifest. Thus, the people of God suffer, not merely because only they of all the peoples are known of God, and have their sins visited upon them, but simply because they are known of God. Jeremiah—the great Old Testament example of apprehension—is followed by the reflective interpretation of the Deutero-Isaiah. Jesus, for the Christian the supreme, limiting case, is followed by the apostolic apprehension and interpretation enshrined supremely in the Johannine and Pauline writings. One example may be quoted from Paul as evidence of the peculiar articulation between this limiting human life and the things of everyday life:

> By glory and dishonour; by evil report and good report:
> As deceivers, and yet genuine;
> As unknown, and yet well known;
> As dying, and yet, behold, we live;
> As chastened, and not killed;
> As sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing;
> As poor, yet making many rich;
> As having nothing, and yet possessing all things.
>
> 2 Cor. vi, 8 *ff.*

Such are the lineaments of eternal life, traced in the dust and sweat of temporality. Every verse repays study, but all that can be pointed out now is the relation to possessions. Of these we have the usufruct, the daily bread for the day's needs. Spiritual possessions must be spent if they are not to atrophy. Most men are subject to the " tempo " of the biological world where " one eats or one is eaten." The true life of man is found by losing it for God and His Providence. The whole creation is disposed to that end, to redeem men from subjection to the factorial " tempi " in their being, from subjection to the world, and give them their destined place as fellow-workers with God, over-lords of Nature.

J. E. Yates.

Augustine and Donne: A Study in Conversion

THE *Confessions* of St Augustine is a work in which the psychologist, the secular historian, the Christian dogmatist, the moralist, the literary critic, and the man of naive piety have all found material for their special interests. But its precision and intensity of narration, and its pervading sincerity, combine to make it more than a mere quarry for specialists; it is indeed one of the most truly *human* documents we possess.

Trusting ourselves to this primary impression, of the essential humanity which controls and shines through the *Confessions*, we propose to turn our back on all considerations which fall short of, by abstracting from, the totality. The key to the whole is to be found above all by a personal search, not by the impersonal curiosity of the scientific inquirer or the covetousness of the devout. We have understood the *Confessions* aright when we realize that the key is in our own selves, and that the prize is concerned with Augustine himself: communion with another person. The presumptuousness of the search is obvious; failure may be the chief reward; but this failure may be itself the key to another situation, where neither Augustine nor any other man is concerned.

With this warning to the reader, then, that he is our companion only on sufferance and must know when to make off on his own search, let us turn to our single preliminary consideration: the nature of the sincerity of the *Confessions*. The work is an autobiography—in particular, a spiritual history. It was written more than eleven years after the event which is the climax of the story, when Augustine was already well established in a mode and amid circumstances of life very different from those which preceded the event. Now all autobiography is prejudiced writing, and Augustine's more than that of a more equable life. The writer necessarily sees his past in terms of his present, selects and interprets past incidents from the point of view of the dominant experience at the time of writing. The sincerest man, moreover, is likely to understand his past life with even more prejudiced insight than the dilettante or the poet. Not only will he cast over his past, now a mellow glow of idealization, now a lurid light of denunciation, but also the very lines of his retrospect will be determined by

his introspection at the time of writing. The real test of sincerity is therefore not meticulous accuracy or truth of a so-called impersonal quality, but the breadth and nobility of the prejudices or presuppositions which determine the nature and course of the sincerity. Edmund Burke was perhaps one of the most prejudiced orators the world has ever known; but that prejudice was the ground and inspiration of his magnificent political and philosophical thought.

Of all other spiritual records at all comparable in this respect to Augustine's, Wordsworth's *Prelude* provides the most instructive parallel. It is beside the point for the critic to question whether Wordsworth really did feel as he says he did when he was a boy. The experience of later years has confirmed and clarified those states of the soul, the animal delight in nature, the pantheistic experience of nature, and the culminating, " panentheistic " sense of

Something far more deeply interfused.

The truth of the past is not a scientifically verifiable fragment of information, but is bound up with Wordsworth's ruling experience as it has slowly organized itself and grown into self-conscious life. Characteristic of this supreme kind of autobiography is the frequent interspersion throughout the narrative of rhetorical paragraphs of commentary on the experience. The autobiography is all the more to be accepted as the truth, the most adequate expression of Wordsworth's real experience, since it has a living point of reference in his latest experience.

The same situation may be observed in the *Confessions*, the same conclusion drawn. The idealizing, interpretative quality of the narrative is a surer guarantee of its truth than the most painstaking impersonal and so-called objective record. For the object is most truly understood and apprehended in its reality when it is spontaneously and creatively handled, when the prejudices of the writer's life and experience bring it into living relationship with his deepest beliefs. Further, the more the manifold qualities are concentrated in a vital organized personality, the more likely we are to find in his writing the objectivity with the fullest content: the objectivity which emerges from the union of a person with his world. It is thus an idle criticism which condemns Augustine's scorn of the tenets of the Manichæans, or his slighting reference to the works he wrote just after his conversion (" though still panting from

the school of pride"), or his exaggeration of the pear-tree episode into one of the great sins of history. Of course he found more in the Manichæans, and of course he did not think his dialogues such bad stuff, or the pears such sinful fruit, at the actual time. But it would be a poor exchange to have the dry statement of these facts (which can in any case be readily enough deduced from the narrative) in place of the living narrative of personal growth. There is no other choice: either the man he feels himself to be, and realizes himself to have become, or an array of disconnected episodes and states; the data provided by an innumerable series of fleeting observers, or the diary of a human soul.

This sincerity, seen in its true light, is the major quality of the *Confessions*. Its master-motive is Augustine's desire to present himself as he is, as he lives now. Literary creation, with its tendency to dissociation from its author and to life in its own right as a work of art, is far from Augustine's mind. In virtue of his experience he wishes, and is able, to step, as it were, out of the pages and communicate directly with his readers.

Two apparent objections to this criticism may be briefly examined. On the one hand, it is stated that (as Augustine himself says at one point) his aim is to edify his readers. Without a doubt Augustine aims at presenting knowledge which may lead to salvation, and not knowledge in any other, less personal sense. But this aim is given reality only in so far as he himself, in his reality as a person, embodies that necessary knowledge: it is the history of Augustine's soul, and Augustine's fate, which controls the knowledge. It is a far cry from this kind of edification to the legalistic, external manuals and pious exhortations which make up the bulk of edificatory writing. On the other hand, it is urged that the *Confessions* are dominated by Augustine's desire to confess himself to God, that the work is, in fact, essentially a prayer. The precise nature of the prayer, however, makes the name almost impossible of application. It is true that the *Confessions* are addressed to God, and that some of the most impressive passages are interpolations, as it were, in the ostensible historical framework, in which Augustine rests himself in God. But the uniqueness of the *Confessions* lies in this, that Augustine considers his relation to God as a stirring encounter in which his passions and his intellect struggle for satisfaction. His prayer is not that of simple piety, or of mystic adoration of the attributes of

God; but it is a prayer in which there is give-and-take, in which the reality of the Thou he addresses confronts the reality of his own person. His questioning mind and passionate nature will not quietly submit to an impersonal power, but will know God in the fulness of their creaturely power. God is therefore not the disinterested recipient, from the hands of Augustine, of a glowing testimonial, but one of the living actors in a drama.

God and Augustine emerge, therefore, from the *Confessions* as living beings, and in the account of their relationship and its consequences for Augustine their present reality is brought home to the reader's own heart and conscience.

The Augustine who writes the *Confessions* considers himself in an important respect a different man from the Augustine whose story is told. He has experienced conversion, and so important does he judge this that he sees the whole course of his life in terms of that conversion. His conversion may, in fact, be called the theme of the *Confessions*.

The actual events which led up to the culminating point or crisis of the conversion Augustine has clearly stated, so that they may be merely outlined here. A preliminary point, which is not so commonly appreciated, is that Augustine was born and brought up a Christian. To draw parallels between the life of our own time and of Augustine's may seem dangerous; but the situation of Augustine does not seem very different in kind from that of many a young man of to-day. His mother was a devout Christian, his father became a Christian only " towards the very end of his earthly life." But the sharp distinction often drawn between the paternal and the maternal influences does not seem justified by Augustine's statements. Admittedly, his father in his impetuous nature and his conservative attitude to the Christian faith may have typified for Augustine to some extent the culture and ambitions of the old, classical way of life. But the real issue for him lies within the Christian religion. Looking back, he sees himself searching for the elusive final certainty of Christianity, vacillating within its manifold structure, moving from point to point, but never utterly abandoning some connexion with it in its intellectual or emotional or institutional aspects. Thus after his severance of relations with the Manichæans he becomes not a complete sceptic but " a catechumen in the Catholic Church, to which I had been commended by my parents, till something certain should dawn upon me,

whither I might steer my course." Throughout the long period which preceded his conversion too much emphasis can scarcely be laid on his mother's influence. The reality which his mother knew, and by which she shaped her habitual life, this brilliant young man did not know for himself, and her life kept continually before him (even when he sought to go beyond the range of her influence) the challenge to a *personal* appropriation of the truths which were then to him mere intellectual propositions.

The first decisive experience came to Augustine in his nineteenth year on reading Cicero's *Hortensius*. This lost work, written just after the death of his daughter, in his old age, when his political hopes were completely dashed, must have been among Cicero's most moving and self-revealing works. It gave Augustine " an incredibly burning desire for wisdom," and changed the object of his ambitions from selfish proficiency in rhetoric to the beginnings of an apprehension of God. This important change of interest led to his association with the Manichæans. For nine years Augustine underwent the strenuous discipline of battling with their doctrines. The special attraction of this sect was twofold. Its explanation of the mystery of evil along dualistic lines was plausible, and claimed finality; its rejection of the Old Testament, by a similar dualistic conception of creation, was equally attractive. The classically trained mind of Augustine could not easily appreciate the brusque, emotional, apparently incoherent and inconsistent habits of Jewish writers. This sect, with its claim to be a more intellectual form of Christianity than others, Augustine abandoned after he had convinced himself of its intellectual incapacities. For two or three years he endured what he calls scepticism, but he had already begun to appreciate the balanced and " more unassuming and honest " position of the Catholic Church. His suffering at this time was great: " And in all the bitterness, which by Thy mercy followed our worldly affairs, as we looked towards the end, why we should suffer all this, darkness met us; and we turned away groaning, and saying, How long shall these things be ?"

From his intellectual uncertainty he is once for all rescued by reading Plotinus. He realizes for the first time the qualitative difference between spiritual being and the being of worldly things, or nature. Evil is suggested to him as being due to the disharmony of some parts of nature with

others, and he has a vision of the harmonious order of creation, with everything finding its true self in God. Evil itself he sees to be the perversion of the will, turned aside from God to lower things: a perversion which may be righted by a turning back to God and the consequent restoration of the harmony. The completion of his intellectual preparation is made when he has read the writings of Paul, and the Fourth Gospel, in the light of the neo-Platonic arguments. Grace and humility and above all the Word made Flesh show him how his intellectual beliefs may be fitted into the history of the Church, and into his inner history, of pride and suffering and failure.

At this point the issue is difficult to follow. The final and determining shock to Augustine's conscience has yet, on our reading, to come. Failure to understand in an urgent existential way the nature of Augustine's longing has led to much misunderstanding. A typical attitude is that of Dr M'Giffert, who roundly states that the scene in the garden describes " his decision to abandon his profession and devote himself exclusively to the pursuit of philosophy. . . . The step was now made easier by pulmonary trouble, which threatened in any event to prevent him from continuing the work of teaching, and by the encouragement and support of his friends who apparently supplied the funds to enable him to live without a profession." The " misinterpretation " of the crisis in the garden for which Augustine was himself responsible Dr M'Giffert explains as due to the influence of his later development within the Catholic Church.

This interpretation of Augustine's conversion as a misinterpretation on the part of Augustine would be more plausible if Augustine were merely the simple, hard-working rhetoric professor Dr M'Giffert makes him out to be. In point of fact, the intensity of Augustine's life, and in particular of the conversion, makes one think of the passionate despairing Kierkegaard, or Miguel de Unamuno with his consuming passion for salvation and his self-abandonment to the " eternal misery " of God, rather than of complacent modern historical analysts. The terms of our thought and sympathy must be more extravagant and absurd, more sensitive to the fiery Southern temper, than the measured and tidy reasonings of modern historians.

On the ground of the nature of Augustine's sincerity alone, as we have examined it above, we are justified in

questioning Dr M'Giffert's interpretation. More positively, however, we believe that the experience in the garden is the very citadel of the *Confessions*, that to it all previous events lead up, and that from it Augustine's later life is inspired and directed.

The nature of Augustine's conversion may be more clearly ascertained by comparison with John Donne. Donne wrote no connected autobiography, but we have many poems, controversial works, letters and sermons, which give sometimes startling insight into the nature and course of his spiritual life. The end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth centuries were in many respects akin to the time of Augustine. Both saw the end of an era; new and disturbing factors had entered into the human, above all the intellectual, situation. It is not sufficiently realized that this is as true for Augustine as for Donne. Augustine was able to envisage the City of God only because he had no longer any sure grip, or hope, of life lived within the civilization of the Empire. The categories which had dominated civilization did not satisfy him, just as the medieval civilization whose lines he was so influential in determining was perceived by Donne to be gone for ever. Each age in its own way

Called everything in doubt,

and the certainty of authority was limited to the powers and longings of the individual. So Donne writes:

On a huge hill
Cragged and steep truth stands, and he that will
Reach her about must and about must go . . .

Consequently, the peculiarly individual note in the *Confessions* is echoed in the self-revealing quality of Donne's work. Men were compelled in such times to fall back, in their search for stability of being, on their lonely status as individuals.

Not only in the situations in which they were cast, but also in their intellectual powers and the vividness and strength of their emotions, Donne and Augustine are strangely alike. Both were compelled by an inward necessity to take the fullest account of the complex but disintegrating world around them, Augustine with the various forms of thought, religion, and moral conduct,

Donne with the new factor of the Copernican revolution in science as well as with the habitual proud Renaissance life with its presuppositions of human self-sufficiency and the grandeur of human possibilities. Characteristic of two men of such powers is the massive intellectual nature of even their most passionate insight into the nature of truth. Thus even the simplest of Donne's love-lyrics is weighted with its argumentative evolution and its subtleties of scholastic thought; just as the simple opening of the *Confessions*, in praise to God, develops into an elaborate and keenly handled debate on the metaphysical implications involved in this praise.

But a real difference is to be seen in the issue for their intellects of this common approach to life. There can be no doubt that Augustine won comparatively soon to what he calls " certainty " in an intellectual way about the major problem which faced him: the existence and nature of God. Thus he writes (VIII, 1): " Thy words had stuck fast in my heart, and I was hedged round about on all sides by Thee. Of Thy eternal life I was now certain, though I saw it in a figure and as through a glass." Donne on the other hand never won to this certainty. Thus quite late in life he writes this sonnet:

> Show me deare Christ, thy spouse, so bright and clear.
> What ! is it She, which on the other shore
> Goes richly painted ? or which rob'd and tore
> Laments and mournes in Germany and here ?
> Sleepes she a thousand, then peepes up one yeare ?
> Is she self truth and errs ? now new, now outwore ?
> Doth she, and did she, and shall she evermore
> On one, on seaven, or on no hill appeare ?
> Dwells she with us, or like adventuring knights
> First travaile we to seeke and then make Love ?
> Betray kind husband thy spouse to our sights,
> And let mine amorous soule court thy mild Dove,
> Who is most trew, and pleasing to thee, then
> When she is embrac'd and open to most men.

The difference is instructive, since any such distinction as Augustine made between his intellectual understanding and his moral and emotional certitude about God seems never to have occurred to Donne. It is indeed questionable if Augustine's position as related up to the end of Book VII has any intrinsic significance for an understanding of his

life. We are bound to look for more, for a head to this body, or a subject to the long sentence. Augustine at any rate seems to have little doubt: to know about the nature of God's being and providence provides insufficient motive for his life.

Certainty about God's existence is not then the culminating and revolutionary experience for which Augustine longed; but his intense desire was for direct experience of God: to be " more stable in God." This desire Donne also has; but his approach to its fulfilment differs radically. Augustine breaks new ground in his insistence on the will as the determining factor. His account of the disintegration of his inner life through the warring of wills within him has great psychological interest; but discussion of it in Augustine's own terms does not necessarily bring home the reality of the struggle and the precise nature of the victory. That there was a victory, and a real change in Augustine's spiritual life, cannot be denied. With the resolution of the struggle Augustine enters into a life whose leading motif is peace: peace echoes back through the account of the earlier life in an indescribably moving way, like a hidden bell pealing across a battlefield. The change may best be described as dimensional: Augustine's life enters with his conversion into another dimension or order of being. No attempt to explain away the circumstances, especially his almost hysterical acceptance of the child's words as God's word to him, can stand before Augustine's own conviction, and its tremendous consequences, of their supernatural validity. For a fundamental transformation and reorganization take place, so that the new life cannot be directly compared with the old; for not merely the intellectual preoccupations, but the very passions of Augustine are changed. The nature of the temptations which he undergoes after his conversion is the same (*cf.* X, 60), but their old well-beaten roads of habit have fallen in. For Augustine has gained certitude of being.

This certitude he himself analyses in terms of his will. The major experience seems, however, to be a mystical one, and may be formulated as the direct revelation of God to the soul, utterly confounding its previous achievement and leaving no part of experience the same: a revelation so terrible and yet so convincing that no doubts are left. So Augustine writes: " By a light as it were of serenity infused into my heart, all the darkness of doubt vanished away."

The power given him by this experience Augustine expresses, then, in terms of the will. But it would seem that the will is used here as a convenient idea for the rationalization of a mystery, for something in him which accepts, or corresponds to, the outpouring of God's grace. But in view of his devastating realization of his depravity, of the miserable nature of even his greatest achievements, it would seem to be truer to say that God's grace provides the will: the gift of God includes this new capacity in Augustine.

For it is his will which plays thereafter so important a part in Augustine's life, and to think of this will as the creation, or the stiffly contested prize, of Augustine himself—or as anything less, in fact, than part of the immediate gift in God's revelation of Himself—is to contradict the statements of the *Confessions*. When Augustine spoke of the enormity of his sins and worldly desires he meant what he said. Admittedly, by human standards he may have been a comparatively good-living man, and therefore may be charged with exaggeration. But in the light of his experience in the garden nothing in him has worth: he can do nothing, win nothing, he is nothing. The standard of judgment is no longer the human standard. What seems in fact to be rhetorical exaggeration is itself a clue to the vastness of the change which came over him. This change involved the giving by God of the very qualities as well as the conditions which made a new life possible.

But, it has been asked, how can such a new order of being, cutting so radically and astonishingly across the old, be supposed, since we find Augustine, immediately after the alleged conversion, whiling away his time at the villa at Cassiacum in discourse with friends and pupils on themes dear to philosopher and academic? Here, in this pleasant aftermath, it is claimed that we have sufficient proof of the essentially unchanged life of Augustine, and that consequently his conversion is to be understood in simple terms of gradual human growth. Augustine has suffered in this respect from over-hasty comparison with men of lesser breed. The patience and debonair quality in his handling of the " school " of friends and pupils; the unassuming continuance of his old way of life—itself a hint of the new inner serenity —these show that the old Augustine had died; more, that he knows the significance of the change. From now on it is to be his task to transform his whole life, with its philosophical and cultural interests and its associations with pupils

and friends, in the strength of that experience. A lesser man would have considered that the interests of his old life must die with it; in a special, mystical sense Augustine's mind as well as his old will, or fragments of will, did die, but only to be slowly re-created in the new organization of his personality.

Donne's experience, on the other hand, with his self-torturing doubt and passionate bending of his life to the service of God, is a far fitter subject for straightforward analysis. In the end, it would seem that you either know, or you do not know, what Augustine means by his conversion, to what strange world he points. But the humanist bias so characteristic of the Renaissance is so strong in Donne that it may be confidently affirmed that he never experienced an illumination corresponding to Augustine's: he was never changed in such a complete way as Augustine. What were changed were the *objects* of his passions, not the passions themselves. Hence we note the reappearance in his sermons of the same images and passions of the " profane " verses. His love for woman simply changes its direction to love of God—but with the same argumentative and self-contradictory nature. (Augustine, on the other hand, exchanged not only the objects but—in virtue of his new will—the very nature of his passions.) The conversion Donne undoubtedly did undergo when he married Ann More was a limited experience, whose characteristic was obedience. Hence no startling voice, but the complex, difficult situation of life—marriage, desire for advancement, a new understanding of love and its integrating power on the passions and the intellect—compelled Donne to bend himself to the service of the Church.

When the resemblances in situation and nature between them are kept in mind, the course of Donne's spiritual history seems as different from Augustine's as it could well be. The decisive experiences for him are not those intense mystic experiences of which he does nevertheless seem to be personally aware, and which he describes thus in one sermon:

> But I will find out another death, mortem raptus, a death of rapture, and of ecstacy, that death which St Paul died more than once, the death which St Gregory speaks of, Divina contemplatio quoddam sepulchrum animæ, the contemplation of God, and heaven, is a kind of burial, and sepulchre, and rest of the soul; and in this death of rapture, and ecstacy, in this death of the contemplation of my interest in my Saviour, I shall find myself,

and all my sins, interred, and entombed in his wounds, and like a lily in Paradise, out of red earth, I shall see my soul rise out of his blade, in a candour, and in an innocence, contracted there, acceptable in the sight of his Father.

This, or indeed any of his sermons, is typical of Donne's sure grip on the facts of religious experience. But his more characteristic personal mood is seen in a poem like the *Hymne to God the Father* (*English Hymnal*, No. 515).

Here we see that the "death of ecstasy" is not, as it was on one occasion at least for Augustine, when he looked out from the window with his mother, an experience of the whole being which confirms him in his radical break with the ordinary world. In other words, Donne never set such high value as Augustine on the new will, which replaced obedience with love, and the strenuous efforts of the creature with the free gift of God. But how could he? He was prevented by the circumstances of his training and career from finding such certitude that nothing could count beyond it. He sought to evolve a philosophy, indeed, which admitted the claims of the body as well as the soul, and its adumbration may be seen in *The Extasie*. He did not know, for God never chose, it would seem, to give him the necessary insight, that renunciation of the body—of the mind, too, of all life—did not mean its denial, but involved a mystic restitution, by which the whole being could be reorganized. How indeed could he know? The medieval system which had broken up even before his day represented the historical effort of men to live this mystical life; it must have been very difficult to perceive in the life of the monks and ecclesiastics even traces of Augustine's renunciation of life and its recovery in another dimension.

In the circumstances, Donne's unyielding, despairing, scholarly, passionate, fantastic, and yet balanced hold on the main facts of his own life is as important a contribution to the history of religious experience as the *Confessions*. He longed as intensely as Augustine for the peace of God, and knew as clearly as any man what eternal damnation meant.

> It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God; but to fall out of the hands of the living God is a horror beyond our expression, beyond our imagination. . . . What Tophet is not paradise, what brimstone is not amber, what gnashing is not a comfort, what gnawing of the worm is not a tickling, what torment is not a marriage-bed to this damnation, to be secluded eternally, eternally, eternally from the sight of God? . . .

But he did not find that peace as Augustine did; he never heard the voice of God, speaking to him directly. To say that Donne should have lost his life in order to find it is a denial of the nature of the situation; for the losing as well as the finding are in God's will to give or to withhold. We can only say, God's will never intruded directly on the human situation of John Donne.

We have come to the mystery with which we began: the mystery of God's will to reveal Himself to men. It is as certain that in this sense Augustine experienced conversion as it is that Donne did not. Towards two human beings similar in character and passions and longing for salvation God inscrutably chose to act in different ways. In consequence, the one has become a gigantic figure in the history of human experience, as well as a person most knowable and real to the readers of his story, while the other has in the eyes of most men dwindled to the proportions of an impressive but rather unsuccessful poet and writer of sermons.

RONALD GREGOR SMITH.

NOTES

ANY subscribers to THEOLOGY in Britain, who are willing to send each month's number after they have read it to a missionary overseas, are invited to communicate with Mrs Vibert, 18, Camden Crescent, Bath, who has a waiting list of would-be S.P.G. recipients.

The Bishop of Durham informs us that the articles that have appeared in THEOLOGY, as well as elsewhere, on Training for the Ministry and with reference to the Interim Report of the Commission of which he is chairman, are receiving the careful attention of the Commission. He hopes at a later stage to write something for us which will help to clear the ground.

We have received the first issue of *Magnificat*, the monthly bulletin of the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership. The Secretary of the Council is the Rev. Gilbert Cope, 28, Maypole Lane, Birmingham, 14; the Bishop of Bradford is the President.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. W. S. T. Wright is Rector of Croxdale, Durham; he was Chaplain of Westcott House, Cambridge, from 1936 to 1939.

The Rev. J. E. Yates, B.D., is Vicar of St Michael's Church, Northenden, Manchester; he has been a Lecturer at Egerton Hall since 1939.

The Rev. R. Gregor Smith is Minister of the Lawson Memorial Church of Scotland at Selkirk.

The Rev. F. C. Synge is Domestic Chaplain to the Bishop of London, and the author of *St Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians : a theological commentary.*

The Rev. Dr Finch is Vicar of Baston, Market Deeping.

Brother George Every is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham, and the author of *Christian Discrimination.*

STUDIES IN TEXTS

Romans x, 14, 15, R.V.

How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent? even as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things.

Almost every commentator, from the earliest centuries to the present day, Calvin being one of the exceptions, assumes that this passage refers to the Jews. I single out for quotation Dr Dodd, whose commentary on *Romans* sets him among the great interpreters of St Paul, because he has the virtue of lucidity. He writes: " If God gave the promise (that everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved) He must have provided the necessary conditions under which men might avail themselves of it. What, then, are these conditions? They are these. (*a*) You cannot invoke the name of Christ unless you believe on Him. (*b*) You cannot believe unless you have heard of Him. (*c*) You cannot hear about Him unless someone preaches the Gospel. (*d*) No one can preach the Gospel unless he is sent by God (for the Gospel is not someone's happy idea, but the Word of God). Very well, then, it must be that God sent preachers of the Gospel to the Jews, among others. And so He did, for the prophet says, How pleasant is the coming of men with glad

tidings of good news. Strictly, this proves (*c*), but it is taken as implying (*d*)."

This interpretation necessarily finds the following verses, 18-20, somewhat recalcitrant. For what St Paul ought to have given was proof from the Scriptures that the Gospel had been preached to the *Jews*. What in fact he gives is proof that it had been preached to the *Gentiles*. All the commentators, having made up their minds that verses 14-20 refer to the preaching to the Jews, are greatly embarrassed. By no one is this shown more clearly than by Dr Dodd. Commenting upon " Everyone who invokes the name of the Lord shall be saved " he writes: " Everyone (Jews included)." This is as though someone, having heard a suffragette's speech thirty years ago which contained the words " Everyone must have votes," were to note that this meant " Everyone (men included) must have votes." The tenor of most of St Paul's preaching (and the cause of most of his suffering) was the theme " Everyone (Gentiles included) who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved." Already in this epistle, i, 16, he had written that the Gospel was the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile. See also ix, 4, 5, 23, 24; xi, 24. He had no need to prove that the Jews had been given the chance of salvation; his problem was to explain why they had missed it. Here he addresses himself to the task of demonstrating the truth of the word spoken by Joel *in relation to the Gentiles*.

A paraphrase will best indicate his argument. This word spoken by Joel, " Whosoever calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," was a Word of the Lord. It is therefore eternally true and immutable. It is a given revelation. We can take it as a starting-point and safely make deductions therefrom. The Lord has said that every Gentile who calls upon His name shall be saved. Now you cannot call upon him in whom you have not believed. It follows, therefore, that belief is possible to the Gentile; otherwise, this word is false. In order to believe you must hear; whence it follows that, unless this Word is a lie, the Gentiles were to hear. In order that there may be hearing there must be preaching; since this is a Word of God and therefore true, it follows that God purposed that there should be preaching to the Gentiles. There can be no preaching without a sending. It follows that there was a sending—or else this Word of God is false.

The commentators began their elucidation, as we have seen, on the wrong lines, and Dr Dodd's note at the end of his interpretation emphasizes the error: " It is a curious line of argument, but there is much of the same kind of thing in rabbinic discussions in the Talmud. One may hope that it impressed his opponents brought up in that tradition. To us it is apt to appear little more than solemn trifling." Just so might a teetotaller, having

dropped into a brewers' convention under the impression that it was a temperance rally, complain that the chairman's argument was curious and unconvincing. St Paul's argument, when one sees what he is aiming at, is not rabbinical or tortuous or curious; it is entirely lucid and logical. Briefly, the point was this: the word which Joel spoke, since it was a Word of the Lord, carried with it the inevitability of its fulfilment. Since God promised that everyone, including Gentiles, who called upon His name should be saved, He fulfilled, completed, His Word by commissioning preachers to the Gentiles.

The climax of the argument is reached in its final sentence, " How shall they preach, unless they be sent ?" Here again, the usual interpretation is at a loss, and the words become merely an appendix. This is clear in the quotation from Dr Dodd with which this paper opened: " Strictly this proves (*c*), but it is taken as implying (*d*)." The argument is complete at stage (*c*). For if St Paul's purpose was to convict the Jews of not hearing (as the commentators tell us) his point was made when he had shown that there had in fact been preaching. The commissioning of the preachers corroborates the existence of the preachers; but the argument does not require mention of it. Some commentators, rightly perceiving that the commissioning is an additional stage in the argument, but wrongly interpreting the trend of the argument, consider that it is introduced to justify an apostolic or authorized ministry. This, however (as Sanday and Headlam point out), intrudes into the passage an idea which is alien to it.

Nothing essential to the usual interpretation would be lost by the omission of verse 15. But St Paul's argument is incomplete without it. For his point was that the Word of God spoken by Joel and the Word which commissioned the preachers were one and the same Word.

To continue the paraphrase. That preachers were sent is shown by Isaiah lii, 7, " How beautiful are the feet of them that bring a Gospel of good things." I am not arguing, St Paul goes on, that all obeyed, for Isaiah said, " Lord, who believed our report ?" That, however, is by the way. Faith comes from hearing, and hearing from the word of Christ, and I have just shown that the prophecy of Joel, which speaks of faith, implies that God saw to the hearing. Psalm xix, 5 proves this, " Their sound went out into all the world." And Israel ought to have known quite well—apart from this word from Joel—that the Gospel was intended for the Gentiles, because Moses told them so (Deut. xxxii, 21), as also did Isaiah—" I was found of them that sought me not; I became manifest to them that asked not of me." But to Israel Isaiah said, " All day long have I stretched out my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people."

Commentators have found difficulty in perceiving the unity of chapter x. Sanday and Headlam, *e.g.*, began a new section with

verse 14. The interpretation I offer allows the coherence of the chapter to be seen. It may be summarized thus: Israel has made two blunders. First, she thought that righteousness was of works and therefore she missed salvation; secondly, she denied all possibility of salvation to the Gentiles on the ground that they knew not the law or the way of righteousness. In fact, however, salvation is of faith, and it is therefore open to the Gentiles.

The defence of this interpretation concluded, we may turn to two points. First, the commission of the preacher of the Gospel in every generation is rooted in a Word of God. He is the fulfilment of the Word spoken by Joel. And he must find there his orders and his obedience. His word is to all men and not to any section; it is of salvation and of nothing else; it is of salvation in the Lord and in no one and in nothing else.

Secondly, we may learn of St Paul the proper use of the Old Testament. He believed that the Word of the Lord was a Creative Word, not an aphorism merely, but an Act. When, through the mouth of Joel, He spoke the Word, " Everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved," He spoke also a Word creating the preachers. Every Word was, from man's point of view, the first stage of a creative act of God, whose last stage was its fulfilment, completion, actualization. The Word of the Lord, as a Creative Word, setting things in motion, was always a forward-looking Word. St Paul's view of the Old Testament cannot be separated from the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel. The Word of God, spoken and recorded in the Old Testament, was fulfilled in the most comprehensive manner when the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us. The Old Testament, in so far as it recorded the Words of God, recorded the beginnings of Acts of God which must at some time reach their culmination, and which had in fact reached their culmination in Christ and His redemptive work.

The Word of the Lord, therefore, had a wider and deeper significance than either the prophet or his hearers could perceive. We do not exhaust the message of Isaiah, *e.g.*, when we have discovered the political, social, and religious situation in which he spoke. We have but dated, as it were, the first stage of a creative Word of God. In so far as our own situation resembles theirs, the Word speaks direct to us in its first stage. But we must also look for its culmination, which we shall find in the work of Christ; and we shall find it recorded, therefore, in the New Testament. The Old Testament must control our preaching of Christ, since He is the prophetic Word made flesh. For precisely the same reason, because He is the prophetic Word made flesh, we are not to search the Scriptures to find in them the history of present or of future eras.

The modern reader of St Paul—encouraged thereto by commentators—is apt to pass hurriedly over the quotations from the Old Testament. But it is not possible to understand St

Paul's theology without a sympathetic comprehension of his treatment of the Old Testament. To regard this treatment with contempt is fatal to good exegesis—as in the passage before us. Moreover, the Church in her wisdom has always insisted that the two Testaments are a unity, speaking of the same thing. The many travesties of Christianity which still thrive would have been killed at birth had we used the Old Testament as the record of the Word of God by which to control and check the interpretation of the Word made flesh, whose record is in the New.

In this passage St Paul shows us the right way in which to approach the Word of God spoken by the prophets: as an eternal, immutable Word, whose full significance is to be perceived only in the light of the Word made flesh. The Old Testament is the more, not the less, significant now that it is followed by the New.

F. C. Synge.

A SYNAGOGUE SERMON

The homily which is printed here, perhaps appearing in English for the first time, is of a kind unfamiliar to most readers of Theology. It is given as an illustration of the character of early synagogue preaching. It is based upon a portion of Isaiah which in the older Lectionary is appointed to be read on one of the " Consolation " Sabbaths which came between the 9th of Ab and the autumn New Year. In the modern synagogue it is used at the same point in the year, with Deuteronomy xxix, 9—xxx, 20 as its " First Lesson." It is one of two addresses provided for the occasion and is taken from the *Pesiqta de Rab Kahana.*

The *Pesiqta* or " Sections " is the name given to an important group of Midrashim based on the Scripture *sections* for Sabbaths and feast days. The work consists of thirty-three or thirty-four such homilies, with texts drawn from the Pentateuchal and Prophetic lessons. It is of Palestinian origin, and though, as it stands, it is considered to come from the seventh century, it is likely that in its original form it is earlier than this by several hundred years. The system of Sabbath reading was changed from a three-year to a one-year course at the beginning of the fourth century.

The sermon itself will recall the address of St Paul at Pisidian Antioch and is particularly interesting as being founded on the chapter from which our Lord took the text of His address in the synagogue at Nazareth.

The translation is made from pages 260-265 of Buber's text.

I Will Greatly Rejoice.

I will greatly rejoice in the Lord (*Is. lxi*, 10) *: Wilt thou not quicken us again that thy people may rejoice in thee ?* (Ps. lxxxv, 7). R. Aha said: Thy people and thy city shall rejoice in thee. " And Sarah said, God hath prepared gladness for me " (Gen. xxi, 6). R. Jehudah and R. Simeon and R. Samuel bar R. Isaac:—Reuben is happy, how does that concern Simeon ? Lo Sarah says, " Every one that heareth it will exult with me." R. Levi said: You find that when our mother Sarah travailed all the childless women were visited with her, and all the deaf ears were unstopped, and all the blind had their eyes opened, and all the dumb were cured, and all the insane restored, and all said, Oh that our mother Sarah might be visited a second time that we might be visited with her. R. Berachiah in the name of R. Levi said: It is to increase the number of the luminaries that the word " made " is used here—" And the Lord did (*lit.* made) unto Sarah as he had spoken " (Gen. xxi, 1)—as it is used of them: " And God made the two great luminaries " (*ib.* i, 16). As the word " made " is used there of giving light to the world so it is used here of giving light to the world. The same word is used here: " And he made a release to the provinces " (Esther ii, 18). As " made " is used there of giving a remission so it is used here of giving a remission to the world.

R. Berachiah in the name of R. Levi said: You find that when our mother Sarah gave birth to Isaac the peoples of the world said, Mercy and peace ! It cannot be that Sarah has borne Isaac. No, Hagar, Sarah's handmaid, has borne him ! What did the Holy One do ? He dried up the breasts of the women of the peoples of the world.[1] Then a family of prophetesses come, kissing the dust of Sarah's feet and saying to her, Do a worthy deed and give our children suck. And Abraham our father said, Sarah, this is not the time for retirement, sanctify the name of the Holy One. Sit in the street and give their children suck. That is as it is said: " Should Sarah give children suck ?" (Gen. xxi, 7). It is not written, should give a child suck, but children. See it is a case of light and heavy.[2] If a mortal to whom rejoicing comes rejoices and makes all rejoice, how much more when the Holy One comes to rejoice with Jerusalem !

I will greatly rejoice in the Lord.—It is written: " This is the day which the Lord hath made; we will rejoice and be glad in it " (Ps. cxviii, 24). R. Abbin said: We don't know in which to rejoice, in the day or in the Lord. Solomon came and made it plain—" We will rejoice and be glad in thee " (Cant. i, 4)—in thee, in thy Law; in thee, in thy salvation. R. Isaac said: *In thee* —*bāk*—in the twenty-two letters in which thou didst write the Law

[1] So with a very slight change of the printed text.

[2] The rabbinical equivalent of *a minori ad majorem.*

for us—*beth* two, *kaph* twenty. There (in a Mishnah) we read: If one has married a wife and lived with her ten years without issue: is he not entitled to regard himself as free from the duty of increasing and multiplying? When he sends her away she is free to be married to another. And the second husband is free to live with her ten years. If she have miscarried, from the time when she miscarried. The duty of marrying has been put on the man but not on the woman. R. Jochanan ben Berakah says: On both of them. It says: " And God blessed them, and God said to them, Be fruitful and multiply " (Gen. i, 28). It happened in Zidon that a certain man married a wife and lived with her ten years and she had no issue. They came to R. Simeon ben Jochai desiring to be separated. He said: Everything that pleases thee in my house, take it and go to thy father's house. R. Simeon ben Jochai said to them: As you were united in eating and drinking so you must not be separated one from the other without eating and drinking. What did she do? She made a great feast and made him drink more than enough, and signed to her maids and said to them: Take him to my father's house. At midnight he wakened from his sleep and said to her, How am I here? She said to him: Did you not say to me, Everything in my house that pleases thee, take it and go to thy father's house? So it is. I have nothing to please me but thee. When R. Simeon ben Jochai heard this he prayed over them and they were visited. As the Holy One visits the childless so the righteous visit the childless. So it is a case of things light and heavy. As flesh and blood rejoicing cause all to rejoice, how much the more when the Holy One comes to rejoice over Jerusalem! And Israel waits for the salvation of the Omnipresent.

I will greatly rejoice in the Lord.—It is like a queen whose husband, son, and son-in-law went to a province by the sea. They came and said to her, Thy sons have come. She said to them, My daughters-in-law will rejoice. So, thy sons-in-law have come. She said to them, My daughters will rejoice. When they said to her, Thy husband has come, she said to them, Rejoice, rejoice. It is perfect. So in the world to come the prophets will say to Jerusalem: " Thy sons shall come from far " (Is. lx, 4), and she answers them: " Let the Mount Zion be glad " (Ps. xlviii, 12). " And thy daughters shall be carried in the arms " (Is. *ib.*), and she answers them: " Let the daughters of Judah rejoice " (Ps. *ib.*), but when one says: " Behold thy King cometh unto thee " (Zech. ix, 9), she answers them, Rejoice, rejoice. Perfect!

I will greatly rejoice in the Lord,
My soul shall be joyful in my God,
For he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation.
(Is. lxi, 10.)

It is like an orphan girl who grew up in a palace. When the time came for her to be married they said to her: Is there no one

to stand for you ? And she answered them: I have one who is as a father; I have one who is as a grandfather. So Israel—They have a merit that comes from Abraham; and they have a merit from our father Jacob, *for he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation*—in the merit that is our father Jacob's, " and the skins of the kids of the goats she put as clothing upon his hands " (Gen. xxvii, 16). " He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness " (Is. *ib.*)—with the merit that is Abraham's, " for I know him . . ." (Gen. xviii, 19). " As a bridegroom decketh himself with a garland " (Is. *ib.*)—You find that when Israel stood at Mount Sinai they pressed themselves (against one another, in reverence) *like a bride* opening one part (of her garment) and holding together another part.

In ten places is Israel called a bride, six by Solomon, three by Isaiah, and one by Jeremiah. Six by Solomon—" With me from Lebanon, my bride " (Cant. iv, 8); " Thou hast ravished my heart, my sister, my bride " (*ib.* 9); " How fair is thy love, my sister, my bride !" (*ib. ib.* 10); " thy lips drip as the honey-comb, my bride " (*ib. ib.* 11); " a garden shut up is my sister, my bride " (*ib. ib.* 12); " I am come into my garden, my sister, my bride " (*ib.* v, 1). Now three by Isaiah—" Thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all as with an ornament, and gird thyself with them, like a bride " (xlix, 18); " as a bridegroom decketh himself with a garland, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels " (lxi, 10); " and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride " (lxii, 5). Now one by Jeremiah—" the voice of mirth and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride " (vii, 34).

Corresponding to these the Holy One put on ten garments. The first garment with which the Holy One clothed Himself on the day of His creating the world was honour and majesty, for it is written: " Thou art clothed with honour and majesty " (Ps. civ, 1). The second garment with which the Holy One clothed Himself was to punish the generation of the Flood, and it was majesty, for it is said: " The Lord reigneth, he is apparelled with majesty " (*ib.* xciii, 1). The third garment was to give the Law to Israel—strength, for it is said: " The Lord is apparelled, he hath girded Himself with strength " (*ib.*). The fourth garment which the Holy One put on to punish the kingdom of Babylon was white, as it is said: " His garments are white as snow " (Dan. vii, 9). The fifth garment with which the Holy One clothed Himself to punish the kingdom of the Medes was vengeance, for it is said: " And he put on garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloak " (Is. lix, 17). Lo, two ! The seventh garment with which the Holy One clothed Himself to punish the kingdom of Greece was of righteousness, as it is said: "And he clothed himself with righteousness as a breastplate and salvation for a helmet upon his head " (*ibid*). Lo, two ! The ninth garment the Holy One will

put on, to punish the kingdom of Edom, is red, for it is said: "Why art thou red in thine apparel?" (Is. lxiii, 2). The tenth garment the Holy One will put on to punish Gog and Magog is glorious, for it is said: "This that is glorious in his apparel" (*ib. ib.* 1).

The assembly of Israel says before the Holy One: Lord of the world, of all the garments thou hast put on there is none to thee so fair as this, for it is said: "This that is glorious in his apparel."

R. Phinehas and R. Hilkiah in the name of Rabbi—It is as though one said, Thou shalt be commended and be pure when thou art judged, "and nations shall see thy righteousness" (*ib.* lxii, 2). R. Levi said: [As his name is] so are His works. Everyone who pronounces the name of the Holy One is worthy of death, for it is said: "And he that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, he shall surely be put to death" (Lev. xxiv, 16). So in the world to come everyone who pronounces the name of Jerusalem is worthy of death, for it is said: "And thou shalt be called by a new name" (Is. *ib.*).

R. Levi said that the Holy One will renew six things in the world to come. These are heaven and earth, and heart and spirit, and Messiah's name and the name of Jerusalem. Heaven and earth. How?—"For behold I create new heavens and a new earth" (Is. lxv, 17). And heart and spirit. How?—"And I will give to you a new heart and a new spirit" (Ezek. xxxvi, 26). Messiah's name. How?—"His name shall endure for ever before the sun: Yinnon[1] is his name" (Ps. lxxii, 17). The name of Jerusalem. How?—"And thou shalt be called by a new name" (Is. lxii, 2). R. Levi said: Happy the city whose name is as the name of the King: and the King's name as the name of the God of Heaven! As the King's name—"and the name of the city from that day shall be, Jehovah Shammah[2]" (Ezek. xlviii, 35). And the name of the King is as the name of God—"In his days Judah shall be saved, Judah and Israel (Jer. xxxiii, 16) and this is his name . . . Jehovah Tsidkenu."

R. G. Finch.

PROSPECTS FOR HUMANE EDUCATION

At the moment humane education in England is in a dangerous and difficult position. History is commonly tolerated as a background to the present international and social situation, to be studied chiefly after 1714. Literature is often regarded as a means to the knowledge of the French and German and Spanish languages, which should lead to keener commercial intercourse and more complete international understanding. And the emphasis in the Spens report upon equality of status for subjects

[1] A symbolical name for the Messiah based on Ps. lxxii, 17 and explained elsewhere as his for he will *awaken* those sleeping in the dust.

[2] See R.V. *Mg.*

in the curriculum offers little hope that any form of humane education will in our time attain to the lost supremacy of the Greek and Latin classics. Indeed the very idea of the humanities is falling into disrepute.

This is not surprising, for our modern philosophy of life does not generally attach very much significance to literature as wisdom, or to history before the modern age except as an indispensable preliminary to modern history. Many Englishmen and Americans cannot believe that people who lived before the age of science have anything important to teach us, though their manner of life and their way of putting their curious and fanciful ideas may be decorative in the extreme. It is all very picturesque when it is embodied in a pediment over the front door, the effects of half-timber work, which may be adroitly copied in what Mr Osbert Lancaster calls "Stockbrokers' Tudor," and poetic inscriptions in olde Englishe for the country café or the cottage mantelpiece. Old-world culture, in which the Elizabethan drama is included, is all very well in its place. A little more of it at the theatre, a touch of it at the cinema, would be a relief from "all this blaring American stuff." But it is a relief precisely because it is remote, discreet, refined, because it has nothing to do with the modern world.

So the teacher of English literature and medieval history finds himself or herself reduced to the position of an instructor in accomplishments, which may at any time be cut out as luxuries if plans are made for the improvement of technical and scientific instruction, or for the organization of a comprehensive grand tour round the reconstructed modern world under the auspices of sociology and civics. Literature and history, like religion, are a sideshow. How can they be made vital again? I believe that the only way of doing so is for our academic educators to recover interest in contemporary entertainment and in the issues of contemporary history. As things now are Shakespeare is dull, because our lecturers in Shakespeare, with very few exceptions, are either too scholarly to see that he ever was an entertainment, or too particular about the entertainments their sensibility can stand to undergo the ordeal of going to the cinema.

Many educated people think of English poetry as a succession of period pieces. All are resonant and rhythmical, many are picturesque, while some are full of profound but obscure and fantastic meanings. But none of it has any entertainment value to be compared with the cinema, modern comedy, or the modern novel of manners. On the other hand the same people are generally quite untrained to see any meaning, bad or good, or any felicities or flaws in the texture of films or plays or modern books. They read literature for the style or the meaning. They sit back in the cinema and enjoy themselves, but in so doing they unwittingly absorb a meaning which is communicated through style, texture, emphasis, tone, a picture of the real

world which often convinces them of its substantial natural truth, because there is nothing there to remind them that it is art, advertisement art or propaganda art, or some other kind of art, but not real life, in spite of the appearance of photographic realism.

I suggest that it is one of the tasks of the teacher of literature to help his pupils to realize the nature of fantasy, all the intimate resemblances and differences between the knights-in-armour romances of the sixteenth century which were adapted by Shakespeare and Greene, and plundered by John Bunyan, and, on the one hand, Fenimore Cooper, Bret Harte and the Wild West, on the other the modern detective story. In all these romances of the triumph of good over evil, or weakness over hardness and strength, a part of the meaning may be fairly constant, but changes in technique and tone make a great difference to the effect they have upon their readers. As the world of romance grows more exactly like the real world, and the hero more like the reader, what was a release from the restraints of material reality for an afternoon in the land of fairie becomes a potent instrument of deception, able to influence the attitude of a whole nation to the future of scientific engineering, or foreign policy, or German-American relations. Herr Klaus Mann, in an important article in *The Kenyon Review*, has insisted on the influence of German boys' stories of good Red Indians and corrupt and vicious Anglo-Saxons upon the mental development of the generation which produced the Nazi party.

There are other tendencies in modern fiction which imply an attitude to life that is not often analysed. The whole history of the naturalistic novel, as we find it in Trollope and Mrs Gaskell, and then again in Arnold Bennett and Galsworthy, needs analysis, that people may come to realize that it is not the last word in a long continuous progress of art towards real life, but a special development due to a particular situation in which a naturalistic treatment of subjects was more acceptable than anything overtly symbolic or fantastic. It is not difficult to show that Arnold Bennett and Galsworthy and H. G. Wells are just as selective in their treatment of their material as George Eliot, Joseph Conrad, and Henry James, whose novels do not look like slices of life. Their lifelikeness is an illusion, which often masks sentimentalism, as in Galsworthy's treatment of his women characters; the snobbery of social success, as in Bennett; and an extravagant idea of the prospects of science, as in H. G. Wells. If the schools could dare to talk about these issues, even if it meant discussing advertisements, posters, films, and the daily newspaper, they would find it easier to interest their pupils in the dramatic methods of Shakespeare and Dryden, and in the outlook implied in *Robinson Crusoe* or the novels of Jane Austen. And if by the use of modern examples they could get them to see that style may convey more than a deliberate and

conscious allegorical symbolism, then they might also see that the architectural form of a Romanesque or a Gothic cathedral means something apart from the symbols in the bosses and the stained-glass windows, and that *Tom Jones* and Georgian architecture may convey a more adequate picture of the world the Georgians saw than can be found in Bolingbroke's essays or in Pope's *Essay on Man*.

The difficulty arises when we want to define our own attitude to such a world picture as that implied in eighteenth-century literature or in Jane Austen. We may convict Pope of serious limitations, and Swift or A. E. Housman, or even Hardy, of a failure of tone, a personal resentment against the universe, which should make us chary of accepting their meaning as a balanced and wise picture of things. We may by comparison find health and poise in Bunyan. But Bunyan said far more fantastic and unbelievable things, for anyone who does not believe in the Christian revelation, than Swift or Hardy, though these always sound convincing in the music of their context. Yet Christian and humanist may agree to associate balance with a sense of proportion, with respect for tradition, with a humble realization that we are not the only people who have had important and moving experiences, and that our experience finds its completion in the context of the experience of others, now and in times past and in the future.

From this point of view history ceases to be primarily an introduction to modern history, and becomes an opportunity to watch the actions of men and women like ourselves in a setting sufficiently different to show up the permanent elements in human nature and in the moral struggle. This is clearly what fascinated Shakespeare and drew him not only to Richard II and Henry V, but to Coriolanus and Julius Cæsar, Macbeth and Hamlet. To get as much as he could squeeze out of his exiguous sources we need far more information than he had. But Shakespeare may be able to teach us that administrative detail is less important than a grasp of the elements in an historical period, not in their distinction from each other and from other periods, but in their inter-relation in a whole pattern, the kind of pattern which has been made available for us in such books as Henry Osborne Taylor's *The Mediæval Mind*, Professor Huizinga's *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, and Mr Basil Willey's *The Seventeenth-Century Background*.

These books have a point of view, like Dr Coulton's *Five Centuries of Religion*, but they are documented, and they do get to grips with the issues of each period in the realization that the clue to them all, classical, Christian, and post-Christian, is to be found in standards of value, religious or humanist, and not in political machinery. This is true even of the Roman Empire, as Mr Warde Fowler has constantly shown. It is as true of China as it is of the European Middle Ages. The purely analytic and anthropological approach to a pre-industrial

civilization which is found in so many modern English and American standard works can do little or nothing to explain it. To psycho-analyse the past, or to interpret it economically, will never give us such insight into the religious spirit as is to be found, for instance, in such passionate outbursts of genuine indignation against religion as the *De Rerum Natura* of Lucretius and *The Golden Bough*. In this matter maturity of feeling is the only way to a grasp of the totality of the facts.

The most natural means to an understanding of historical religion in this country and this civilization is the study of the Christian Scriptures, which is a traditional part of the English school curriculum. And much is being said about the increase and improvement of biblical teaching, " historically and objectively," as recommended by the Spens Committee. It may well be doubted, however, what exactly the effect of such an improvement would be within the context of the scientific and sociological education which is the very thing that makes Bible reading so very difficult for educated English people today. The method of historical criticism can tabulate all the difficulties they find in the biblical attitude to history, and in what may be called the unfinished poetry of the Bible, the continual failure of prophets and evangelists to find words to describe events and experiences which are inexplicable, yet part of God's unchangeable purposes. But by itself it has no key to the sympathetic understanding of all that they were trying to do.

The traditional key to the understanding of the Scriptures was the humane education which Christian schools of the patristic period inherited from the Græco-Roman world. The trivium and the quadrivium were a study of language, the language of words, grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic, and the language of mathematics and music. To some such study of language it seems to me that we must return, if we are to understand not only the Bible but any religion at all, or any poetry, music, or art. All these things are becoming closed books to our scientifically educated experts, who are to wield so much power in our society after the war. I think this must involve going behind modern history, to study a period when the arts were close to the life of every man and the mind of an age could be read in its architecture and its poetry. But this does not necessarily imply a return to the classics. I can conceive two possibilities: one a study of English and French literature and history in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, of the gradual disintegration of the medieval vision of life and the rise of the sciences. This would not involve the study of any language which is not also of practical, commercial use (an important consideration when there are so many useful things which must be learnt), and it would be near enough to the roots of the industrial revolution to please the economists, and perhaps to teach them something about the ethical conditioning of economic

development. But it might very reasonably be urged that the best humane education for the present day would be a study of the breakdown of the Roman Empire and the emergence of Byzantium and the medieval West. The subject is topical, if disturbing to some complacencies. The personalities are interesting. And someone might very well argue that if we are to learn Latin at all, it ought to be the Latin of the Vulgate, the matrix of Italian and Spanish and French, the last *lingua franca* of Europe, rather than the Latin of Cæsar and Cicero, which was dead by the second century. And St Augustine, in the *De Civitate Dei* and *The Confessions*, is a more interesting classic than Cicero or Ovid. There are now more books about "the Dark Ages" than there ever were before, and, although they all tend to be controversial, they are by no means all tendentiously orthodox. There is Gibbon to be read, and Lecky's *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne*, and Professor Bury's *Later Roman Empire*, besides the ecclesiastical historians. The literary originals include Procopius, a most talented latter-day pagan, besides Eusebius and St Augustine. But it would be impossible to study the period properly without taking the Christological controversies seriously, and at least trying to see why people were so exercised about them. We might then come to realize how important were the decisions that were then taken for the whole history of the West. It was then that we turned our backs on the Buddhist hope of an escape from the wheel of birth, a return from being to the stillness from whence all the emanations issue, and chose rather to look for a regeneration, a re-birth through blood and death, believing that the Son of God had been born, and had died and risen again, that Mary was in truth the mother of God, and that the Word was made flesh, and suffered in the flesh, and became and still remained man.

Such a curriculum would be an education for an age of confusion, spiritual and material, and it is not easy to deny that our age is likely to remain such for some time. It would also be an opportunity to understand Christianity in another setting than that of our own civilization. This would be a corrective to the very common idea that every religion belongs to a culture, flowers from it, and fertilizes it, an idea which has been in some measure popularized by Hilaire Belloc and Christopher Dawson as well as by Spengler and Sir James Frazer. No doubt medieval Christendom was a civilization which grew and decayed and died; so was Byzantium. But they inherited not only their religion, but the classical formularies of their religion, from an age which was sociologically distinct from either. To grasp this gives us a better idea of the persistence and significance of Christianity, whether we believe or not, than the consideration of the Faith as a cement for our own civilization, which has certainly grown away from its religion.

Moreover, either plan, the study of the Renaissance or the study of the Dark Ages, would renew the vitality of humane studies by bringing them into a living relation with the kind of questions about the end of our time which are now occupying the most intelligent of our sixth-form boys and girls and university students. And they would give the scientifically educated a chance to realize modes of thought and feeling which are older than our own culture and may persist when it has passed. This is much more important and much more valuable than anything that can be done by the rearguard of classical scholars to add to the prestige of the traditional accomplishments. But it can only happen if those in all walks of life who are genuinely concerned about the state of culture, as it is revealed in popular music, popular reading, the spell of the press and of advertisements, will combine to promote some kind of sales-resistance.

George Every, S.S.M.

COMMENT ON LITERARY PERIODICALS

If " Anglo-American collaboration " is not to be a synonym for Anglo-American absorption, it is vital that we should keep in touch with the best elements in America which are resisting the usual sequel to a drive for national unity—the swamping of independent literary activity and standards. The collapse of American Marxism, followed by the Japanese attack and the war, easily produced a reaction against the " intellectuals " similar to that which was celebrated in *The Times* as " the eclipse of the highbrow." This appearance of English philistinism has been noted in the *Partisan Review*,[1] one of the few American critical journals surviving. (We understand that *Kenyon Review* is still going, but that the admirable *Southern Review* has ceased.) The May-June number of *P.R.* contains a brilliant essay on " The Sense of the Past " by Lionel Trilling (author of the best study of Matthew Arnold), in which he urges the need to " complicate our sense of the past ": the simplification of history has led to the false blaming of present evils upon the characteristic ideas of the past (" romanticism," " idealism," " optimism," etc.) as if we could have avoided the evils by avoiding the ideas; whereas ideas cannot exist apart from the thinker and the situation, and " behind every idea that is effective lies the human will and an idea is good or bad, morally speaking, according as the human will that uses it is good or bad." There is also a curious posthumous fantasy by

[1] 45, Astor Place, New York. 1 dollar 50 cents yearly (about 7s. 6d.).

that fascinating writer Kafka; and an entertaining political duel between Max Eastman (ex-Marxist) and James T. Farrell (novelist and socialist).

Scrutiny,[1] keeping our end up over here by celebrating its tenth year, contributes to Anglo-American exchange, in general by being what it is at its own best level, and in particular by an interesting article in this (April) number on "Language and Function in American Music"; W. H. Mellers, first-rate music critic, discusses Aaron Copland and Mark Blitztein—both able and serious American composers who are willing to work alongside cinema and stage technique. The reviews are informatory, and there are interesting articles on Dickens' relation to the theatre, and on *Cymbeline* (where Fr A. A. Stephenson, S.J., finds significant "value" imagery, though Dr Leavis demurs). Dr Leavis' editorial recounts with deserved satisfaction the work of *Scrutiny* in the last strenuous decade. We hope that Mr Eliot's reference to it at Malvern will encourage an increasing support.

Horizon[2] continues its claim to be the English implement of culture-salvage. Sometimes there are good things in its dustbin; the reviews are improving in quantity and quality, its accounts (and reproductions) of contemporary painting are useful, and the "Irish Number" (January, 1942) was excellent. But in the May number the editor recommended artists and writers to improve their acquaintance with science by reading such "basic books" as the *Science of Life* (Wells-Huxley), Gollancz' *Outline of Modern Knowledge*, the *Bible of the World*, *The Glands and Their Functions*, etc. A flimsy basis for the new renaissance. We prefer *Townsman*, which has become *The Scythe*[3] and is more exclusively geophil than ever. Ronald Duncan, in his May editorial, is still concerned to discover the right kind of spiritual revival; there are some good poems, and articles on forestry and tobacco-growing. This periodical "works for a synthesis between the poet, the priest and the farmer, and views with distrust those who would imprison the first, silence the second, and nationalize the third." *Adelphi*[4] has become quarterly and improves with the reduction. In the July-September number Mr Middleton Murry has a sermon on Easter; J. Hampden Jackson points out the weaknesses of E. H. Carr's *Conditions of Peace* (especially its belittling of nationalism); and M. Chaning-Pearce writes carefully and prophetically of Christianity and Community. *The Wind and the Rain*[5] is a young periodical founded by professing Christians. Apart from a poem by Charles Williams (spring number) there

[1] Deighton, Bell and Co., Cambridge. 10s. yearly.
[2] 6, Selwyn House, W.C.1. 1s. 6d. monthly.
[3] West Oill, Morwenstow, N. Cornwall. 2s. quarterly.
[4] The Oaks, Langham, Colchester. 6s. yearly.
[5] 15, Newton Court, Kensington, W.8. 1s. quarterly.

is nothing striking. But if the venture is encouraged discoveries may be made: the new *Penguin Book of Religious Verse* shows that the soil is rich.

MARTIN JARRETT-KERR, Nov. C.R.

MIRFIELD.

CORRESPONDENCE

LESSER FEASTS IN THE 1928 PRAYER BOOK

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Dr Lowther Clarke seems to have misquoted, or at least given an arbitrary interpretation of, the "Table to regulate the Service when two Holy-Days fall upon the same day." The words "shall be either pretermitted or transferred" are not there applied directly to any Red Letter Day, but are part of an introduction to the whole table. This provides for the pretermission of the Service of every Sunday, but the transference of every Saint's Day which appears in the right-hand column. The 1928 book in general says clearly if a practice is "permitted but not enjoined." It is therefore unlikely to mean here that, while the Saint's Day must "be either pretermitted or transferred," the minister is free to do which he pleases. The natural interpretation is that the table orders the transference of the Saints' Days and the pretermission of the Sunday services. On this view there is no authority for Dr Lowther Clarke's statement that "a Red Letter Day which clashed could be omitted entirely."

On any view the whole Service of such a Day may be used at another time. It may be argued that this is greater honour than the mere retention of a memorial Collect on the original date, which is normally the most that is permitted for a Lesser Feast. The major Saint's Day does not fare worse than the minor—with one exception: on the last four days of Easter and Whitsun weeks the Service of a major Saint's Day is forbidden, but that of a minor Saint's Day permitted. The discreet minister would not avail himself of this permission.

It might be added that a minister, who so interprets the table as to omit a Red Letter Day which he might have transferred, is not likely to commit the illogicality of retaining the Collect of a Black Letter Saint.

The question is whether in a future revision of the table the list of "Principal Feasts" should be extended so that certain seasons are cleared, not only of the full services of Red Letter Days, but even of memorial Collects. Canon J. N. Dalton met the desire for this with the suggested rubric: "When any Black

Letter or Minor Saint's Day doth happen to fall on a Sunday, or on a moveable Feast or Holy-Day, or in the week before or the week after Easter, or in Whitsun week, its observance will be pretermitted for that year" (*The Book of Common Prayer: Proposals and Suggestions*, 1920, pp. xlvii, 526). The suggestion does not seem to have been adopted in any of the preliminary drafts of the 1928 table. The Roman rules (which cannot easily be applied to our problems) keep Maundy Thursday to Easter Tuesday and Whitsun Monday and Tuesday free from commemorations.

Yours, etc.,
J. K. YOUNG, O.G.S.

HOLMESIDE,
FINES ROAD,
MEDOMSLEY, CONSETT.
July 10, 1942.

WITHOUT COMMENT

[THE following "Hymn for Airmen," written by Dr Marie Stopes, has been sent to R.A.F. Chaplains by the Chaplains' Department at the Air Ministry.]

Lord of the blue and lovely sky
We rise on shining wings,
In Thy great service swift to fly
Above all earthly things.

Console our loved ones' human grief,
Thy wings ward off their fears;
O Lord, our service may be brief,
We live in deeds not years.

Lord of winged creatures, we would fly
To Thy bright realms of love:
Grant our aspiring search on high
May meet Thy heavenly dove.

To the tune "O God, our help in ages past."

BOOK REVIEWS

THE SICKNESS UNTO DEATH. By Soren Kierkegaard. O.U.P. 14s.

Kierkegaard's *Sickness unto Death* appears in an English translation when, for all who have courage to be conscious, our own "sickness unto death" is most evident. The book is a study of the dialectic of despair—a subject in which we are all at school.

It is the fruit of Kierkegaard's maturity, for it dates from the year 1848, when at last he felt justified in speaking in his own name and abandoned that veil of anonymity which, for ten years after his conversion in 1838, he had felt constrained to adopt. The change symbolizes his sense that a true self had been born within him. This book gives to us, therefore, his own integrated word. He is no longer exploring or discussing; he utters forthright and freely, in Laurence Binyon s language, his own

> . . . swift words, words like flames . . .
> Words armed and terrible, storming the heart . . .

He wrote much else: but this book contains the epitome of his insight and vision of the nature of dread and despair, of the life of spirit and faith and of the dialectic of the Christian tension. Of all his writings it is that most likely to become a Christian classic.

The anatomy of the life of spirit which he discloses is that of a life which proceeds from an agony of consciousness which is itself a dying to despair, from despair to that state of tension whence the flame of spirit (which is eternal life) is struck, and from that tension to the life of the lovers of God and so to the fruits of the Spirit, "love, joy, peace." "A believer," he declares, "is surely a lover, yea, of all lovers the most in love." It is upon that final and triumphant note and not, as is so often conceived, in the long counterpoint of conflict and paradox, that Kierkegaard's real gospel comes to rest and his ultimate word is to be found.

But it is in an agony of awareness that this procession of spirit begins, an awareness which leads inexorably to despair. " . . . the more consciousness, the more intense the despair." From such a consciousness self and the will to choice proceed. "The more consciousness, the more will." The individual, the self, emerges in the "instant" of choice from that chaos of consciousness upon which Spirit broods.

This law of individuation in the life of spirit is integral for Kierkegaard's thought. "The Christian heroism," he writes, "is to venture wholly to be oneself, as an individual man, this

definite individual man, alone before the face of God." It is courage which demands not only choice, but also grace, the grace which " compels him to be the self he does not will to be."

To become individual, a self (not to become " spiritual " in some emasculate pietistic sense) is to become " concrete," and " to become concrete is a synthesis." Thus the conscious man is " a synthesis of the infinite and the finite, of the temporal and the eternal, of freedom and necessity." That synthesis is the fusion of the tension and dialectic of sin and faith, despair and hope. It is a state to which few attain or, having attained, dare to endure: " many are called but few are chosen." It is a state which society condemns: " in our age it is a crime to have spirit." But it is the state of spirit, for " spirit is the self." And it is the state of true freedom: " the self is freedom."

But this self " gained by the infinite abstraction from everything outward, this naked, abstract self," is not the final self; it is " the first form of the infinite self," embryo self and spirit. And, since it involves the deliberate choice of the tension and dialectic of the life of faith, it is also the choice of despair, a despair which " has something of the eternal in its dialectic." For it faces the infinite and the eternal, and the self is a " synthesis in which the finite is the limiting factor."

This despair of the temporarily conditioned spirit confronted with the infinite-eternal is infinitely more dreadful than the despair of the natural man. It is a " sickness unto death," an " agonizing contradiction . . . everlastingly to die, to die and yet not to die." It is so because the self is, in its essence, potentially eternal. " . . . despair has entered into something which cannot burn . . ." Here we stand upon sub-Christian ground. For here is also the faith of Plotinus: " *ouden apoleitai tón ontón* "—the faith of the Bhagavad-Gita: " never the spirit was born. The spirit shall cease to be never." It is the point at which most modern theosophy comes to rest.

Such despair is " a phenomenon of the spirit." It is, as Kierkegaard wrote elsewhere in his Journals, " that dialectical hovering which, though in fear and trembling, never despairs." In that dialectic is the paradox upon which all his thought and faith are poised. In life that paradox and dialectic become the life of Christian tension, of the frontier between despair and faith.

The faith which thus polarizes despair is itself eternal life. In the field of such a faith we pass from sub-Christian lowlands to Christian summits. For the pagan " *cogito ergo sum*," to *think* is to be, Kierkegaard substitutes the Christian counter-creed, " to *believe* is to be." The one lives the soul-life of natural consciousness and becoming, a life transient and perishable as the flowers of the field, the other the spirit-life of Being. For " faith is man's relation to the divine."

But, for our frontier-being, it is a faith subject to the dialectic

paradox and tension whence it derives. The Christian swings between faith and unfaith; his faith is a

> " . . . swinging-wicket set
> Between
> The Unseen and the Seen."

" To reach truth one must pierce through every negativity." Faith and doubt are linked in an indissoluble dialectic. For Kierkegaard, as for Emerson, " a saint is a sceptic once in every twenty-four hours."

But beyond that " swinging-wicket " of despair and faith is that land of light where God's lovers live in an " immediacy," a new spontaneity of reborn spirit of which the immediacy of sense is the reflection and image in time. Thus we reach Kierkegaard's fundamental " formula " for the life of spirit. " . . . by relating itself to its own self and by willing to be itself the self is grounded transparently in the Power which posited it." It is " grounded *transparently* "; we glimpse the dim concept of that life of reborn personality or spirit, crystal-clear, the mirror of Eternal Being, the state of saints, which is the lode-star of all Kierkegaard's conceiving.

Such is the starry faith of which the lineaments emerge from this book, faith in the life of spirit (" eternal life ") rooted in the dialectic of despair, despair which is itself sin and yet (*O felix culpa !*) the occasion of redemption, the sin which " lies in the will, not in the intellect," as so many of our humanists would have us believe. For the self born of despair is confronted with Christ and, since " a self is qualitatively what its measure is," therefore the law of spirit, that " the more self, the more intense the sin," and therefore the despair, comes into fatal force.

It is a faith of which the challenge for our " day of wrath " and despair seems clear. But it is properly as a corrective rather than a catholic and full-orbed Christianity that it must be conceived. It is a faith rather of prophet and poet than of priest, creative rather than conservative, for the twice-born rather than for the once-born. It seems dubious, indeed, whether Kierkegaard comprehended or could make contact with the conservative, priestly, once-born religion which, in all its aspects, he so condignly and consistently condemns. For him the " true priest is even more rare than a true poet"; the priest, like the poet, is born and not made. In fact, the priest is equated with the prophet. Such was Kierkegaard's congenital and inveterate bias.

In this colour-blindness to the claim of catholicity and churchly Christianity we reach his limits. His word is essentially prophetic and corrective; he is a mountain or a desert guide, no tiller of the soil. He climbs Pisgah; he does not cultivate Canaan. Such a criticism may clarify judgment; it does not derogate from his greatness. The religious dialectic of the prophetic and the

priestly consciousness is one only surmounted by the saints, and in this respect also Kierkegaard was a dialectician. It is precisely because he is so that he can speak so cogently to our own despair.

He calls to despair and diagnoses its dialectic with a consummate acumen. But he points also towards a Christianity of the Spirit beyond our decomposing pseudo-Christianity of the soul, towards a life and a religion of the Spirit, an " eternal life " beyond the exhaustion-point, the " tragic climax " of our dying life. " First death, then life "; his own laconic aphorism is the pith of this as of all his books. It is the pith of the Gospel.

M. Chaning-Pearce.

Oxford.

The Discipline of Peace. By K. E. Barlow. Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

This is a book which should be read by every competent theologian, and indeed by every intelligent citizen, although it is to be feared that not all competent theologians—nor, for that matter, all intelligent citizens—will find it easy to understand. Dr Barlow's phrasing is frequently obscure and imprecise and the reviewer is left with a feeling that a reader less sympathetic towards Dr Barlow's outlook and purpose than himself might easily put the book down without any very clear impression of the vitally important truths which it endeavours to convey.

The book should be read by every intelligent citizen because it is outstanding among the apparently endless stream of commonplace and worthless publications about the nature and foundation of the great democratic planned world order of universal peace and prosperity which is to arise miraculously and phœnix-like from the ashes of the present conflict. Dr Barlow leaves on one side the dreary and uninviting Utopias depicted in so many contemporary books on the " situation " and busies himself with the fundamental natural conditions under which alone is it possible for any civilization whatever to persist. The vaguely scientific ideology which has been dispersed abroad among quite unscientific men and women through such media as Pelican ninepennies, broadcast talks, and articles in popular journals of the semi-cultural variety, has created an unfortunate and quite misleading impression that man through the power of science can do what he likes with Nature. Dr Barlow insists on the fundamental truth that Nature really has a nature, a being of its own with its own laws and way of life, and one which must be stedfastly respected by any community which aims at prolonging its way of life and history into an indefinite future. Nature cannot be successfully

exploited over a long period. There is an ultimate truth about the earth which demands to be acknowledged and reverenced and which has a right to set bounds and limits to all human aspirations and planning. Dr Barlow is thus in fundamental opposition to almost all current political outlooks. The key word of the great majority of modern political systems, ideal or actual, is exploitation. We have had the exploitation of nation by nation and class by class, of one part of humanity by another, and now our weary and unimaginative idealists and reformers propose that the whole human race should go into peaceful partnership for the purpose of exploiting the earth upon whose surface it moves; in other words, they advocate the exploitation of one part of the creation by another. Thus humanism rises to the supreme heights of arrogance and dares to conceive of the health and well-being of man not merely in isolation from the health and well-being of the universe but even as antithetical to them. But the war against the universe to which our idealists and reformers would commit us is one in which we cannot conceivably be victorious. Dr Barlow advocates the better way. Man must learn to live peacefully and harmoniously with Nature, neither asking from it more than it can give, nor giving to it less than it must ask. A rare wisdom !

But if the book is essential to the citizen as citizen it is equally essential to the theologian as theologian. Can man by searching find out Nature ? Is natural science alone competent to furnish us with a complete and adequate doctrine of Nature ? Do we require a doctrine of the purpose and status of the realm of physical being before we can rightly understand and use scientific discoveries ? Dr Barlow's book is important because of the penetration with which it raises these questions and significant because it raises them from the scientific side.

We live in an age of theological revival. Slowly and painfully, and not without profound theological misgivings, we are rediscovering the great truth that theology is verily and indeed " the Queen of the sciences." Gone is the apologetic phase during which the theologian strove to prove that he had a province and subject matter of his own, so that his science could legitimately be allowed to take its place side by side with the other sciences, a period during which he attempted to make his peace with the professors of other intellectual disciplines by telling them in effect that if they would leave him alone he would not attempt to interfere with them. Now we know that theology is by nature concerned with the whole of reality, with the creatures as much as with the Creator. It does not deny the legitimacy of the other sciences, still less seek to substitute itself for them, but it does lift itself above them all in providing each with the intellectual background against which alone its results can be clearly seen and rightly interpreted. This is a

time of profound theological revolution. From a scrutiny of the content of Revelation armed with categories of thought and intellectual methods which are the fruit of man's intercourse with natural things, we are moving to a scrutiny of life and nature, time and history, for which we are equipped with unique standards of judgment and horizons of vision by the violent intellectual upheaval which is the necessary consequence of accepting the Gospel. " Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world ?" So it is that we have moved from our doctrine of God to our doctrine of Man. It is the Christian doctrine of Man which renders it possible for us to make sense of the very diverse conclusions yielded by such human sciences as psychology and sociology. But we cannot stop at the doctrine of Man. We must move on to the doctrine of nature, the doctrine which will provide the proper and hitherto unseen theological and philosophical setting in which the conclusions of the natural sciences cohere together in an intelligible scheme. Repeatedly wise educationists, dismayed at the increasing atomization of the contemporary intellect, can be heard crying out for synthesis. Synthesis is the primary intellectual need of man. Where there is no synthesis, there is no sense. The foundation of synthesis is the doctrine of creation, with its assignment of intelligible and mutually complementary purposes to all the orders of being. Well may the twentieth-century theologian thrill at the thought of his vocation. It is good indeed to be a theologian in such a time as this. Understanding the creation through the redemption, he presses on, from the doctrine of God to the doctrine of Man, and from the doctrine of man to the doctrine of Nature, towards that intellectual consummation which already he can *foresee*—although his chances of surviving to *see* it are slender indeed—a new *Summa* and a new St Thomas.

When the new St Thomas comes, it is possible that he will acknowledge his indebtedness to Dr Barlow's important book, which in page after page testifies to a movingly sincere search from the scientific side for precisely that intellectual foundation for natural science, one which will define its scope and visualize its purpose, which it must be the function of a resurgent Christian theology to provide.

J. V. Langmead Casserley.

Oxhey.

Revelation and Reunion: A Response to Tambaram. By Gerald Webb Broomfield. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

This book is an important addition to the literature of the movement for the reunion of Christendom. In the first part Canon Broomfield analyses the mode by which human beings may receive divine revelation, whether individually or corporately. His aim is to raise the question whether differences

in the beliefs of different Churches may not be due to the coming of a common objective truth into minds which subjectively are conditioned differently for its reception. Here his epistemological discussion is a welcome piece of clear thinking expressed with simplicity and revealing depth of insight. The practical upshot may be seen in the following four quotations:

> On this basis, frankly accepted, we can admit that our beliefs may contain an element of error without disloyalty to our conviction that they are derived from divine inspiration. On this basis also we can hope to discover the probable causes of error, and that will go a long way towards the removal of the errors themselves. (P. 40.)
>
> Thirdly, if the account given in this book of God's way of revealing Himself to men, and of their struggle to apprehend what is revealed, is even approximately true, the possibility of error cannot be excluded even in a Church of which the Holy Spirit is the " pervading life." (P. 67.)
>
> If such a view of it as I have given were thought to be on the right lines, and true, at least in the main, we should be in a position to discuss our differences in belief with greater hope of their removal. Each would be better able to appreciate the beliefs of others, and to admit the possibility of imperfection in his own, without any feeling of disloyalty to the Truth. Recognition of the human element in the formation of belief is fully consistent with unwavering faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. (P. 103.)
>
> There are some who hold the view that full dogmatic agreement is a necessary preliminary to organic union. This is not the same as the demand for conformity, because it allows for the possibility of modification on both sides, but it is equally inconsistent with the conception of the Church which we have in mind. If the functions of the Church in revelation are such as I described them earlier in this chapter, the sharing of the same spiritual life within the one communion and fellowship is intended to be a means towards the attainment of a clearer apprehension of the truth, and of fuller agreement with regard to it. A demand for too large a measure of agreement as a preliminary to organic union would be inconsistent with this whole conception of God's purpose. (P. 12.)

It has emerged in the course of the argument that the Church is, among other things, the organ of God's revelation, and that in divided Christendom we have to ask what contribution towards our fuller understanding of the whole truth is to be found in each of the different Churches. The second part is a presentation of episcopacy as a contribution from the side of Anglicanism. Canon Broomfield starts from the Edinburgh definition of the Church as adopted at Tambaram, argues that this involves a God-given structure to ensure its continuance as a visibly functioning body down the ages, gives his reasons for holding that episcopacy is the will of Christ for His Church, and concludes with a willingness to accord a " primacy of honour " to a reformed papacy.

This summary is so brief that it can give no idea of the

importance of the book. There is, indeed, danger of its doing the author injustice by making people feel that they have heard all this before and have no wish to read it again. But in this kind of work, as Canon Broomfield has shown in Part I, it is not the conclusions which matter so much as the methods by which they are reached and the arguments on which they are based. The considerations he advances are not controversial debating points. They are an honest statement of well-reasoned convictions sincerely held, put forward in a truly Christian spirit from a desire to help the cause of reunion, and this presentation of the case for episcopacy will have to be taken seriously in all future discussions of the subject.

Here I will content myself with noting three points.

First, it is a pity that, in dealing with the relation of episcopacy to the New Testament, Canon Broomfield has taken no notice of Dr Newton Flew's *Jesus and His Church*. This would have been of less account if he had been relying on his own presentation of the case, but in view of his references to Turner's revision of Gore's *The Church and the Ministry* the omission of any reference to Flew's criticism of it is unfortunate. For Flew and Broomfield start from the same premiss in respect of our Lord's intention to establish a visible Church, and arrive at different conclusions about its order.

Secondly, important as is this question of order, and in particular episcopal order, we must not forget that there are still questions of faith which in some directions may cause difficulties in the way of reunion. On pp. 74 and 76, for example, there are passages about human freedom which will cause no difficulty to me or many another English Christian, but may lead some Lutherans and Calvinists to wonder whether the Edinburgh Conference was right in 1937, when it said that outstanding differences on the subject of grace were not sufficient to justify divisions between Churches.

Lastly, while I agree with Canon Broomfield in his general view of the place of episcopacy in reunited Christendom, I do not think that his negative attitude towards intercommunion (p. 116), or towards the ministerial anomalies of such an interim period as is proposed in the South India scheme (p. 123), is a necessary consequence of that position. It is not obvious that we can deduce directly from what we believe to be the will of God for the reunited Church the actions which are His will for us in our present condition of disunion. Starting from the agreed principle that in this condition of disunion we cannot behave as though we were united, one may draw the conclusion that during the period of disorder we may recognize anomalies for which there will be no justification when the grounds for them are removed. It may be that a wide extension of the practice of mutual open communion on the basis of the baptismal unity referred to on page 106, and a temporary toleration of

ministerial irregularities, provide the surest as well as the speediest way of reaching the goal which is Canon Broomfield's aim. It may be that this is the way which is the will of God for us here and now.

LEONARD HODGSON.

OXFORD.

AN ANTHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS VERSE DESIGNED FOR THE TIMES. Edited by Norman Nicholson. Pelican Books. 9d.

This little anthology raises a great many interesting problems, to which the editor seems to have been indifferent. "The structure of the book," he says, "is Christian, in that it deals with the modern man's conception of God, and his life in relation to God." The question immediately arises whether a Christian structure is in fact implied in the modern man's relation to God. It does not seem to be helpful to clarity, either about poetry or about Christianity, to identify in this way modern religious sentiments with Christian faith. Behind this question rises a more properly æsthetical consideration—whether in fact poetry (or verse) in which the writer happens to use Christian symbols is *ipso facto* religious (far less Christian). Is *Paradise Lost* really a religious poem? There is a notable confusion of the religious and the æsthetic categories, which needs to be clarified if we are to understand why in fact religious people are quite content to have their faith expressed for them in "conventional images and worn-out phrases," and, worse, in sheer bad verse. A third general question is whether "religious verse" which is "designed for the times" is most appropriately culled from the moderns and near-moderns at all; or whether religious (or Christian) verse is not rather the achievement only of other, essentially religious (or Christian), ages.

But it is probably unfair to Mr Nicholson to press these questions in a short review. His introduction is short, and not intended to do more than allure the prospective reader. There are indeed, as he implies, some strange bedfellows here: D. H. Lawrence and T. S. Eliot, Thomas Hardy and G. K. Chesterton and W. B. Yeats, and a good many younger poets. There are short poems, of which *Carol* (by John Short), *Eve* (by David Gascoyne), *Quem Vidistis Pastores* (by Wilfrid Childe), are rather more than typical examples; and there are extracts from longer poems, nativity plays and the like. It is doubtful if extracts from most of the longer works (such as Charles Williams's *Thomas Cranmer of Canterbury*, J. D. C. Pellow's *World's End*, and Rayner Heppenstall's *Sebastian*) can be very attractive or significant in an anthology. But again, the extracts from T. S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral* and *The Rock* and from Andrew Young's *Nicodemus* have intrinsic passion and beauty. And in fact, though poems by Anne Ridler, David Gascoyne, and Clifford Dyment, for

instance (to name personal preferences: there are 29 contributors in all) show great sensitiveness in the handling of familiar symbols of Christian faith, it is on the " poets of established reputation " that the main weight of the designation " for the times " must lie. Thus the rather casual representation of Manley Hopkins (that modern born out of his time) does not prevent his work from standing out, passionate and piercing as always, as really religious poetry: faith and words fused. Beside him even Eliot's solemn choruses seem a parade of deshabille. Of all the work of living poets represented, that of Andrew Young is apparent as the most consistent and satisfying achievement. Both in the extracts from *Nicodemus* and in the short poems an authentic religious awareness is presented with finish and form.

Nevertheless, it is highly questionable if " people who do not often read poetry " will be tempted into reading this selection. People who are most interested in Christian faith will continue to find their sustenance in less individualistic poetic pastures; those most interested in what is significant and universal (and is that not in the end in the profoundest sense what is " religious "?) in modern poetry will want a more representative selection; and those most interested in religious poetry will seek it in poets writing within more comprehensive and settled ages, or within a more vital Christian order, than the present. Perhaps this anthology could be followed up with one more capable of fulfilling the stated design. In particular, out of the riches of the seventeenth century, from Donne and Crashaw, Vaughan and Traherne and King and Herbert, but also from later times, much could be drawn for our time. The present book is really designed *by* the times rather than *for* them. In spite of the editor's attempt to set each poem within a conventional Christian scheme, it is precisely in their lack of design, of form, that most of these poems express less the faith than the torment and longing of our time. Is it not the mark of real religious poetry that the form should have the clarity or radiance (*claritas*) of faith just as much as the symbols themselves ?

Ronald Gregor Smith.

Selkirk.

Chariot of Wrath: The Message of John Milton to Democracy at War. By G. Wilson Knight. Faber and Faber. 10s. 6d.

The denigration of Milton, an activity which began during his lifetime and occupied the attention of numerous personages, now remembered only by scholars, throughout the succeeding century, was one of the most interesting literary revivals of the inter-war years. One can readily see why. Milton's most prominent characteristic is energy—an energy which pulsates throughout his closely-knit prose and which gives to the elaborate

structure of his verse the vitality of a Bach passacaglia. Moreover, his heroes are men of audacity and power. Little wonder, then, that he proved distasteful to the *littérateurs* of the last decade: fatigue and fatuity being the hallmark of their work.

Mr Wilson Knight, however, rejoices in this heroic energy; indeed, his book has a fervour that is almost too overpowering even for an admirer of Milton like myself. But he believes that Milton has a message for democracy—more specifically British democracy at war—and his book, though full of penetrating remarks about the Miltonic imagery, is exegesis rather than pure criticism. Still, this is not a bad fault, and in invoking the shade of Milton he has excellent precedence. In times of crisis people turn to their national heroes and prophets for inspiration—this is borne out by anthropology and the literature of all countries—and Mr Knight in following Wordsworth is merely establishing the pattern of cultural behaviour which tradition demands. Thus Milton himself has similarly referred to " the divine and admirable Wickliff " as a type of Englishman whose powers were an example of our true destiny.

Now although it is a normal habit in time of crisis for a people thus to invoke the spirit of its past heroes, believing that some of the energy latent in the national stock is focused in them, and although there is a tremendous psychic urge to make this invocation, cooler judgment reminds us that we may be easily misled by attributing to the present the formulas of the past. Especially must we be careful with regard to words, for they change their meanings and may perhaps be given a purely arbitrary relevance to our needs. Mr Wilson Knight, however, believes that Milton is really topical, and he makes out an excellent case for supposing that the Hero-Redeemer personality with whom Milton was preoccupied is a symbol of the English race finding its true Christian vocation.

Like Samson, like the Messiah of *Paradise Lost*, we must be agents of righteousness endowed with aggressive energy, prepared to do battle with the powers of Satan, which the author equates with Hitlerism. At the moment we are still, he thinks, unaware or only partly aware of our duty: " A truly power-impregnated righteousness," he says, " is as yet alien to our thinking and all but outside our vision." These are strong words, and although I am prepared to admit that we have many shortcomings to answer for I do not wholly agree. Surely the author has felt something of the Æschylean grandeur of our bombed cities with their calm, stoic citizens—and to be " power-impregnated " may not mean to show off one's resolution. Truth to tell, I am a little bewildered by this book. I have seen valour and fortitude in this war, and I have found the attitude of those who reveal these qualities to be much as the late H. W. Nevinson described it during the last war—very modest.

Essentially that is a virtue; it is something like Christian

humility, and it is a sign, I think, of staying power which will help us to win the war. The trouble with Milton is that he writes not as an active participant in the fighting (he is the complete antithesis to Fairfax who was a soldier) but as a poet in a reserved occupation; thus his immense interest in weapons of war is essentially the civilian's—we soldiers have pet names for our guns, Milton writes like a columnist fascinated by an unfamiliar vocabulary (*cf. Paradise Lost*, Book VI).

Mr Wilson Knight has said so many acute things about the religious and ethical element in Shakespeare that it may seem presumptuous to challenge him on his reading of Milton. And for Milton as a poet of the seventeenth century I have nothing but admiration; his landscapes have the dark splendour of a Poussin, his championship in verse of the beauty of marriage as opposed to the traditional theme of adultery, combines with Spenser's to give English verse a novel splendour in the development of literature. But he was not much concerned with the virtue of compassion and despite his admiration of " thrice great Hermes " he did not learn from the Hermetica that reverence for childhood as a state of innocence which is one of the loveliest things of the seventeenth century. No, his Eden is far off in time, further than the heart can bear, nor is his redemptive Christ the Christ who took up little children in His arms and blessed them. But power, to have a Christian connotation, includes that sort of strength, I fancy—pity and humility as well as fortitude and heroism.

Nevertheless, and despite some lapses of taste such as that which describes " the Chariot of Paternal Deity " in *Paradise Lost* as " at once a super-tank and super-bomber "—a comment worthy of Bentley—this is a stimulating book and it reveals afresh the vigour and beauty of Milton's unsurpassable rhetoric. We might all profitably re-read *Areopagitica*.

JOHN SHORT.

LETCHWORTH.

CYRIL BARDSLEY, EVANGELIST. By Joan Bayldon. S.P.C.K. 9s.

Cyril Bardsley was a man who deserves a biography, and this book is a model of its kind. It is written gracefully, easily, and with restraint. Miss Bayldon makes no attempt to glorify her bishop, but allows his own decisions and the words in which he set them forth to show what manner of man he was. She resists the temptation to find pegs for her own views on the great issues touched by his life, though she is quite obviously well qualified to form opinions of her own upon any of them. She has pieced together with much skill the successive stages of his life, carrying her readers from one to the next without any sense of break or jar. The result is a coherent picture of a rich personality, growing in stature as each new set of tasks called for the special exercise of one or other of his gifts and powers. It was at

St Helens (where he is affectionately remembered to this day) that among the glass-workers and miners of Lancashire he found in parochial life the kinds of contact which enabled him to become in St Paul's sense, and with the same motive, " all things to all men," and later on to give the impression of a " human " bishop. " You talk in a very handy way, my lord," said a Peterborough churchwarden, " you are very straight." As Chief Secretary of the C.M.S. he was faced with one of those wearisome controversies between conservative and liberal churchmen which the plain Christian finds so hard to understand. The alternatives were to narrow the basis of the society or to allow a secession. Bardsley steered the General Committee with steady courage and a complete absence of bitterness into the latter, as the lesser evil. After a year's service as first secretary of the Church Assembly Missionary Council he was called to the bishopric of Peterborough. Miss Bayldon quotes a remarkable tribute in one of the Church papers:

> In an anxious world the man who can laugh, the man who can pray, the man whose eye is before the dawn for the signs of spiritual revival, and whose soul is on the leash ready for action at the moment of release, is the man who will carry other men forward with him. And such is Cyril Bardsley.
>
> There is no doubt that he will grasp his new task as he did his old—master its details, apply himself to every human need it represents, attach himself to the personality of those around him, live in wide horizons, and, free to order his own steps in a larger sphere than he has ever had before, he will emerge steadily in his own diocese as that bishop for which the Church is always asking—a Father in God.

The two outstanding features of his episcopate were the creation of the bishopric of Leicester and his gatherings of clergy and laity at Swanwick and Sheringham. In his approach to laymen he was not a little helped by his gift of humour and his simple delight in games. But what really drew men to him was his love of God and of His other children. He wanted to win them, not alone for their own sake, but because he was constrained. That motive shone through all his utterances. He had no great gift of eloquence, and at times he gave the impression of strain, as though he was forcing a weary tongue to its work of persuasion. But to hear him was always to be immediately convinced of a passionate sincerity which carried his words straight to the heart.

ALBERT LIVERPOOL.

MIDNIGHT HOUR. By " Nicodemus." Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

Anyone who looks at all deeply into life—as most of us are bound to do before we get to the end of it (and assuredly never more so than now)—must inevitably be aware of the presence

of some dark power, some pervasive ill, some deep disease rooted in the very constitution of the world, as tares are rooted among wheat. Even in "normal" times, such as the comparatively rare interludes between wars when this malignant influence is delusively latent, "as it were a lion lurking in secret places," a foreboding sense of impending catastrophe is ever present to the sensitive mind. Away over the horizon of our bright sky—but only just over—a thunderstorm seems always brewing. And this sense of impending catastrophe is apparent not only in the outer world of circumstance but in the inner world of consciousness too. At every turn, life seems to offer the promise of a good that it fails to impart; it is too cruelly bitter-sweet; everywhere there is apparent throughout its bright texture the dark thread of suffering frustration; there seems an ineliminatable perversity running through it both in warp and woof. Man is the microcosm of his world, and as the world is a battleground of contending forces of good and ill, so also is the soul of man the scene of irreconcilable conflict. The former seems to be almost a projection of the latter, or the latter a reflection of the former. Only those who are spiritually dead already—the placid, the timid, the self-sufficient—are blind to the overwhelming of the tragedy without (even in "peace-time"), for the very reason that they stifle the torment within; and the converse is equally true. To them the agony of a tragically divided consciousness may be a spectacle for curious wonder, but not for fellow-feeling as for a comrade-in-arms who is sore beset. They do not know that he who is thus wrestling—at grips with the nameless angel—is really far wiser than they, wiser with the simple, candid, intuitive wisdom of the awakened spirit.

This book is a piece of spiritual autobiography by a powerful, original, and acutely sensitive mind. It is representative, for it epitomizes an inner experience that must be shared by many others in these times of crisis, but which few could describe with such vigour or so vividly, if only for the reason that few have felt it with such intensity. It is representative also in another sense, for it reflects in miniature the aspects of the universal tragedy.

> In fact the terrible and terrific drama of the war is, point by point, an apocalypse of this war in my soul, and I am obsessed with the thought that this inner will in the end decide that outer war (a terrifying mystery), that we fight in our own hearts, not merely for our own salvation, but for that of the world. That is terrifying, incredible, and yet, deep within me, I know it for truth. And, as in this outer, so in my inner war, I must confess to defeat after defeat, to an ever more complete isolation, to no more than a desperate defence of the central fortress (like Britain) and delaying action, sallies and retreats, with victory ever further from view and the forces of death massing ever more mightily.

Yet in the end he wins—not in his own strength. He comes through the dark valley, well in view of the sun-lit slopes. One

inexplicable fact remains: that he is denied the opportunity of sounding this note of victory in the place where it should rightly be heard—namely, the walls of the Church.

It is difficult to praise the literary quality of this book, save to say that it matches its theme; it has the glint, precision, and keenness of steel. Its chiselled phrases have the sharp clarity of an engraving. It is interspersed with passages of sheer poetry, when the spirit " listens ", and exclaims, " If only I could sing !" And sing he can, and does. This book is truly memorable, not only for the profundity of its matter but the force and the grace of its manner—a rare blend of delicacy and strength.

GEORGE SEAVER.

HAWARDEN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: A. Boggis and K. Budd, *The Day is at Hand* (5s.); L. P. Jacks, *The Confessions of an Octogenarian* (15s.).

BLACKWELL: *Report of Proceedings at the Church Unity Octave* (5s.).

BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS, PACIFIC UNIVERSITY: C. K. Gloyn, *The Church in the Social Order* ($1.50).

BURNS OATES: J. Lebreton and J. Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church*, Vol. I (16s.).

CENTENARY PRESS: D. R. Davies, *Down Peacock's Feathers* (5s.); C. Williams, *The Forgiveness of Sins* (3s. 6d.).

JAMES CLARKE: A. E. Simpson, *A Parson's Politics* (1s. 6d.); F. E. Johnson, *The Social Gospel Re-examined* (8s. 6d.).

DACRE PRESS: M. R. Newbolt, *The Bible and the Ministry* (2s.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: L. Richards, *Social Control and Personal Freedom;* L. Artingstall, *Economics and the Christian* (4d. each).

FRIENDS' BOOK CENTRE: P. W. Bartlett, *Quakers and the Christian Church* (1s. 6d.).

FRIENDS OF REUNION (DUBLIN): James S. Rutherford, *Christian Reunion in Ireland* (2s.).

H.M.S.O.: *Conditions in Occupied Territories : Religious Persecution* (3d.).

LONGMANS: M. C. D'Arcy, *Death and Life* (5s.).

JOHN MURRAY: R. Ellis Roberts, *H. R. L. Sheppard* (15s.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: M. D. R. Willink, *St Mark's Gospel* (2s. 6d.).

NISBET: O. Piper, *The Christian Interpretation of Sex* (10s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. H. Henson, *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, Vol. I (16s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: W. Temple, *Freedom, Truth and Peace* (6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: *God's Will in Our Time* (9d.); W. A. Brown, *A Creed for Free Men* (5s.).

SHELDON PRESS: J. H. Oldham, *Real Life is Meeting* (1s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: R. M. French, *Serbian Church Life* (3s. 6d.).

W. H. SMITH AND SON: H. J. Garland, *The Alpha Method of Speaking and Preaching without Notes* (2s.).

SPEARMAN: A. Stewart, *Silver Wings* (1s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher